



**FOREIGN  
BROADCAST  
INFORMATION  
SERVICE**

# ***JPRS Report***

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**  
**Approved for public release**  
**Distribution Unlimited**

## **Soviet Union**

***Political Affairs***

**DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2**

REPRODUCED BY  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

**19980126 168**

# Soviet Union

## Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-89-015

### CONTENTS

9 MARCH 1989

#### PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Solovyev Addresses Leningrad Oblast Party Conference [Yu.F. Solovyev; <i>LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA</i> , 24 Dec 88]	1
Krasnodar Kray Officials Discuss Kuban Party Apparatus Restructuring [I. Polozkov, et al.; <i>PRAVDA</i> , 22 Dec 88]	17
Tallinn Party Conference Concludes Reports-Election Campaign [R. Amos, F. Kaazik; <i>SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA</i> , 21 Dec 88]	19

#### HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

Development of USSR Into a Democratic System Seen as Lengthy, Difficult [A. Migranyan; <i>XX CENTURY AND PEACE</i> No 12, Dec 88]	23
--	----

#### RELIGION

Preacher Proposes Ways To Increase Bible Availability [V. Geide; <i>PADOMJU JAUNATNE</i> , 14 Dec 88]	26
BSSR CP CC Official On Decline of Religious Rituals in Belorussia [S. Pavlov; <i>KOMMUNIST BELORUSSII</i> No 12, Dec 88]	26
ERRATUM: Moslem, Russian Orthodox Officials Meet with KaSSR Council of Ministers	27

#### CULTURE

UkSSR Publishing Chief on Revival of Literary Heritage [Yu.P. Dyachenko; <i>RADYANSKA UKRAYINA</i> , 4 Nov 88]	28
Activities of New Ukrainian Cultural Society Described [A.S. Ivanchenko; <i>MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA</i> , 5 Oct 88]	31
RSFSR Writers Union Plenum Attacks OGONEK, Leading Reform Figures	33
Zaslavskaya, Aganbegyan Assailed [LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA No 51, 23 Dec 88]	33
Plenum Resolution [LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA No 51, 23 Dec 88]	42
Discussants Attack Reform Publications [LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA No 52, 30 Dec 88]	43

#### SOCIAL ISSUES

Moldavian Official Discusses Local 'Mafias' [N. Demidenko; <i>SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA</i> , 15 Jan 89]	59
Pochivalov Calls for Reappraisal of Attitude Toward 'Emigre' Concept [L. Pochivalov; <i>LITERATURNAYA GAZETA</i> , 28 Dec 88]	61
Alma-Ata Young People's Fund Chairman on Youth Activities [A. Kuvinyy; <i>KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA</i> , 19 Nov 88]	66
LSU Komsomol Secretary Interviewed [I. Ziedonis; <i>PADOMJU JAUNATNE</i> , 20 Dec 88]	69
Reader Calls For Soviet School Humanization, Praises LPF [N. Kamergrauzis; <i>PADOMJU JAUNATNE</i> , 14 Dec 88]	71

#### REGIONAL ISSUES

Estonian Activists, Officials Assess 1988 Political Year [V. Ivanov; <i>SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA</i> , 24 Dec 88]	73
Estonian Supsov Debates Status of State Language [SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 14, 15 Dec 88]	74
Latvia's Interfront Holds Constituent Congress	84
Congress Opening Day Proceedings, 7 Jan [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 8 Jan 89]	84
Interfront Council Member Belaychuk's Report to Congress [A.K. Belaychuk; <i>SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA</i> , 10 Jan 89]	88
Further Report on Congress Proceedings [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 10 Jan 89]	94
Officials Criticize Lithuanian Liberty League's 10 Jan Meeting [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 12 Jan 89]	94

BSSR Purge Victims, Afghanistan War Dead to be Commemorated [A. Petrashkevich; SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 1 Dec 88] .....	95
Belorussian History Texts for Children Requested [V. Ugryumyy; KOMMUNIST BELORUSSII No 1, Jan 89] .....	96
Officials Discuss Cause, Effect of Strikes on AzSSR Economy [BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 25 Dec 88] .....	97
Azerinform Report on Gorbachev Meeting With AzSSR, ArSSR Officials [BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 6 Dec 88] .....	99
Tashkent Obkom Secretary on Uzbek People's Front, Nationalities Issues [E.I. Fazylov; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 6 Dec 88] .....	99

**Solovyev Addresses Leningrad Oblast Party Conference**

*18000402a Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA  
in Russian 24 Dec 88 pp 1-4*

[Speech given by the First Secretary of the Leningrad Oblast Party Obkom Yu.F. Solovyev at the 28th Conference of the Leningrad CPSU Oblast Organization held on 23 December 1988]

[Text] Comrades! The period for which the CPSU Obkom is reporting on has been full of events of enormous historical significance. The ideas of the April (1985) Central Committee Plenum have been embodied by the party in a specific program for the revolutionary renewal of society and the party has begun widely to consistently implement this. The 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th All-Union Party Conference were key signposts along this path.

The extensive democratization of social life has activated all social strata in society and has forced a rethinking of the difficulties and contradictions as well as the lessons of our nation's past. The radical economic reform and the improving of the political system are being channeled into a single stream as these release the profound sources for accelerating the development in all spheres of our society's life.

The new political thinking has had a positive effect upon improving international relations, strengthening security and developing collaboration between nations and peoples. The world public has shown concerned understanding and support for our principled and constructive proposals raised in the speech of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev before the United Nations.

Having commenced the work of unprecedented scope and complexity, the party has assumed enormous responsibility for the fate of the nation and for the fate of socialism.

This also predetermines the nature of the tasks confronting all the units of the party and in the foreground is an urgent need for a more rapid restructuring in the activities of each primary party organization and each communist.

The party obkom has preceded from these prerequisites in its daily practical actions, having focused the attention of the bureau and the secretariat and the party apparatus on supervising the implementation of the major party theses, on indoctrinating the personnel and increasing the organizing role of the gorkoms and raykoms as well as the primary party organizations in carrying out the tasks of restructuring.

During the report period, the activities of the party obkom, its elective bodies and the communists in the soviets, the trade unions and Komsomol were organized on the basis of the practical measures worked out by the obkom to carry out the theses of the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th CPSU Congress.

A predominant majority of the members and candidate members of the party obkom has assumed an active and constructive position in preparing the questions to be discussed and has effectively carried out the party line on the spot.

The plenums have closely analyzed the state of affairs in the area of the ideological support for the changes being made, of the course of the radical economic reform and the implementing of the Food Program.

Of fundamental significance was the plenum which in December of last year reviewed the report of the bureau of the party obkom concerning the work on the leadership of restructuring. Such reports, as is known, were made in all the primary, city and rayon party organizations. They became an exacting check on the most important thing, that is, to what degree the diverse areas of our activities correspond to the tasks raised by the party. As a result, critical personal evaluations were made for the members of the bureau and the party committees and from these the correct conclusions have been drawn.

The demand raised by the plenum of shifting the center of gravity to the organizational, ideological and political support for the course elaborated by the policy has become a guideline for a majority of the communists elected to the leading party body and has had an effect on changing the style of their thinking and practical activities.

The Decree of the CPSU Central Committee "On the Work of the Vyborgskiy Raykom in Leningrad" has played an important role in carrying out this line. The obkom bureau has examined the reports by a number of the city and rayon committees in light of the demands of this fundamental document and this has had a positive effect on their activities and on strengthening party influence on carrying out economic and social tasks.

A decisive rejection of the administrative-arbitrary methods and close political leadership over the inferior party elements to an ever-greater degree characterize the activities of the Vasileostrovskiy, Moskovskiy, Nevskiy and Lomonosovskiy Raykoms, the Vyborg and Volkhov Party Gorkoms (First Secretaries, Comrades N.N. Korablev, A.I. Aleksandrov, V.P. Sidelnikov, V.M. Nelyubov, V.A. Shlyakhtov and Yu.A. Melnikov). These rayons have established real conditions for the independent and creative work of the primary organizations and for increasing their militancy and authority in the labor collectives.



However, such an approach has become the norm far from everywhere. With good reason many party organizations subjected their elected bodies to sharp criticism during the report-election campaign, judging the work of a number of them as unsatisfactory, including the party committees of the LenKARZ [Leningrad Carburetor Plant] Association, the Kirishi GRES No. 19 and the Northwestern Correspondents Polytechnical Institute.

The membership of the city and rayon party committees have been over one-half replaced. During the period of preparing for and conducting the report-election conferences, one out of every five secretaries of the CPSU gorkoms and raykoms was replaced.

Comrades, immediate conclusions must be drawn from these facts. The essence is that the communists and the workers are assessing evermore closely the real results of restructuring and the activities of the party cadres. The new personnel of the party obkom must support and develop such a trend in every possible way.

But one cannot help but see something else. In certain party organizations all concerns and all responsibility for the state of affairs in the collectives are usually entrusted to the party committees and bureaus. Here a significant part of the party members (the figure is one out of six in the oblast organization) is still passive and has not joined in the practical work.

In July of last year, the obkom plenum adopted a decree which obliged each communist to be given specific assignments in participating in carrying out the tasks of restructuring. In the context of self-criticism it must be admitted that although changes have occurred in this area, the obkom bureau and secretariat and the city and rayon party committees have still not been able to ensure the proper execution of what has been planned.

The serious concern over this state of affairs on the part of the communists developed into sharp criticism and this was rightly focused on the elective bodies of all levels in the course of preparing for the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

The ongoing broadening of the rights and powers and responsibility of the primary organization and the freeing of them from petty interference understandably do not mean the CPSU gorkoms and raykoms have no obligation to ensure effective political leadership over the party organizations. This function has been and remains the main one for them. The slipshod execution of this function reduces the effectiveness of party control, it erodes the principle of democratic centralism in the party and creates grounds for demagoguery and irresponsibility.

Recently, such a situation has developed in the Sosnovyy Bor Party Gorkom. The inefficiency and inconsistency in the work of the city committee and its bureau as well as the inability of the former first secretary to unite and

organize the active and the low exactingness on the primary organizations led to a decline in the authority of the gorkom and to reduced activeness on the part of the party units in resolving the urgent questions in the life of the labor collectives and the city as a whole.

Many economic and soviet workers are slow in getting rid of parasitic attitudes and a desire to shove their duties onto the superior party bodies. The party organizations often follow them.

At the city report-election conference certain delegates from the Leningradslanets [Leningrad Shale] Association sharply criticized the Slantsy Party Gorkom for the fact that the enterprise was slow in resolving the questions of improving recreational and labor conditions, the technical reequipping of production and was not improving the management structure.

The problem exists. No one has released the CPSU Gorkom (First Secretary V.V. Nazarov) from the responsibility for the state of affairs in the labor collectives. This stems from its role as a body of political leadership on the rayon's territory.

But in such instances it is important to clearly place the accents. Obviously, in the given instance it is a question, primarily, of the passive position assumed by the association's party committee and its low demands placed on the leadership and engineer-technical workers who number quite a few, over 600 persons, for carrying out direct official duties.

The bureau of the party obkom, having examined the question "On the Work of the Leninskiy CPSU Raykom as a Body of Collective Political Leadership" has demanded that the city and rayon committees eliminate the replacing of the state and social organizations with party committees and carry out a correct political line primarily by the communists working in them.

The restructuring carried out in the party apparatus has been aimed at a clear delimitation of functions between the party, economic and soviet bodies. On the threshold of the conference, the oblast committee confirmed its new structure.

Sections have been set up in a consolidated, integrated form and their number has been reduced by almost one-third. But this involves not only quantitative changes. It is a question of a fundamentally new content in the work and its focus. In the forefront are the practical questions of providing help to the elected body in analyzing and working out ways to resolve the problem of restructuring in the economic, social and ideological spheres.

For this it is essential to decisively abandon the obsolete command methods of activity on the part of the apparatus as well as the replacing of a real organization of things by an apparently busy chairman and excessive

paperwork. Both the sections and the secretaries of the party obkom, the gorkoms and raykoms must be quicker and more energetic in avoiding the troubles of such an archaic style.

Life itself has required radical changes in the personnel policy carried out by the oblast party organization. The obkom plenum clearly formulated the essence of the new approaches. This means the decisive overcoming of the formal-bureaucratic and administrative methods and the broad introduction of certification and the election of leaders on a competitive and alternative basis. Democratization and glasnost make it possible to assess persons not according to previous merits but in terms of the end results of their activities.

This is precisely how the party committees are working in the new manner at the Kirovskiy Zavod [Kirov Plant], Izhorskiy Zavod [Izhorsk Plant] Associations, the Vyborg Shipbuilding Yard, the Lomonosovskaya Poultry Plant and Leningradskiy Sovkhoz (party committee secretaries, Comrades A.P. Zhitenev, Yu.P. Arkhipov, O.V. Tsvetkov, A.N. Krasilnikov and V.A. Vlasova).

During the report period, the party gorkoms and raykoms certified around 30 percent of the leaders for their positions while over 35 percent underwent interviews in the CPSU oblast, city and rayon committees. Over the 2 years, more than 300 leading cadres were released as unfit for the assigned job.

Fundamental changes have also come about in the reserve for promotion. This is being now formed democratically and publically. At present, there is an open reserve for all the workers of the CPSU gorkoms and raykoms, including the secretaries, as well as economic leaders. Instruction for them has been organized.

Work with the reserve has been tested out during the current report-election campaign. Some 28 percent of the secretaries of the primary party organizations and 40 percent of the secretaries from the shop party organizations and one out of three party organizers have been elected as alternate candidates from it.

However, the activities of many city and rayon party committees in the given area still requires major correction. The most characteristic mistakes were discovered by the obkom bureau which examined the report by the Gatchina CPSU Gorkom (first secretary, Comrade M.A. Novikov) on this question. The lack of effective and consistent indoctrinational effect on the members of the elected party bodies, the secretaries of the party committees and bureaus and the incompetence of certain cadres led to a situation where a portion of the primary party organizations had not kept up with the dynamically developing events.

At times, outside the perusal of the gorkom are the problems of developing in the workers a new style and methods of leadership inherent to our times. Many

effective forms of preparing the cadres for promotion are poorly used including, in particular, sending them for training to other party committees.

Such facts are rather typical.

Certain party organizations have been slow to master advanced experience and democratic methods in cadre work, they do not put the required influence on this process and let it work spontaneously. As a result, in a number of collectives they have promoted not so much energetic and enterprising as "undemanding" and "bland" persons.

In the Association imeni Komsomolskaya Pravda, in the Gipronikel [Main Design Institute for the Nickel Industry] Institute and a number of other enterprises and organizations, the meetings to elect directors have been reduced to the clash of groups, and corporate ambitions and not the interests of the job have gotten the upper hand. The collectives have been working now for a long time without leaders and, it must be said, they are operating poorly.

The task of the city and rayon committees is to help each party organization master the art of modern cadre policy. This is the key link which requires unflagging party attention.

The major changes in the economic and political life of society have brought about a fundamental restructuring of the territorial-sectorial system for skill improvement and retraining of the cadres. Virtually all engineer personnel and the economic apparatus must undergo retraining. Presently, retraining is being provided in 133 different organizations, including in 20 institutes and affiliate institutes for advanced training, at faculties, courses and training centers.

However, the effective use of the existing facilities is being impeded by sectorial barriers and by the lack of contractual economic relations between the enterprises, organizations and training institutions. Obviously, the question has arisen of establishing a scientific and procedural center for coordinating the activities of the territorial cadre retraining system and organizing a self-supporting managers school.

Without this we will be unable to overcome the acute shortage of specialists having a qualitatively new level and possessing extensive knowledge on the boundary of different areas and capable of quickly mastering advanced techniques and production methods, modern economic methods of organizing labor and production.

The CPSU Obkom during the report period has paid particular attention to increasing the role of the soviets, trade unions, the Komsomol and other social organizations in carrying out economic and social tasks and in increasing the influence of the communists employed in them.

At present, the soviets are developing important positive processes and the activities of the deputies, deputy groups and commissions are rising. The practices of organizing the membership of workers on the soviet institutions are being improved.

Leningraders have been given extensive opportunities to become acquainted with the course of the sessions and the drafts of the decisions being adopted as well as to make their own proposals and additions.

At the same time, restructuring in the soviets is still being carried out slowly. This particularly concerns the executive bodies and above all those of the rayon level. It is difficult to overcome bureaucracy and the departmental isolation. There is not the proper coordinating of efforts by the sections and administrations. The reorganizing of the structure and the cutback in soviet personnel have not produced noticeable results. On the city and oblast level, they still have not achieved the assumed mobility and the abandoning of excessive centralism.

Under these conditions, there is still a medium for the manifesting of inertia, irresponsibility and acceptance of the problems which have built up over the years in the area of public health, trade and in public transport.

In assessing the situation which has come into being here, it is important to clearly distinguish two crucial aspects. A certain lag in the development of the physical plant for a number of sectors of the city economy can, of course, be explained by the residual principle which operated here for decades in allocating funds for these purposes.

But full responsibility for the lack of order, organization and often elementary discipline must be assumed by the executive committees of the soviets, by the administrations and services and personally by their leaders.

Obviously, the bureaus of the obkom, the party gorkoms and raykoms must return to a thorough analysis of the style of work of the communists in the soviet institutions and provide them with practical aid, and where there is a need for this, reinforce the cadre membership.

The new realities of cost accounting, economic management methods, the electing of cadres and the councils of the labor collectives to an ever-greater degree are influencing the increased awareness and creative activity of the workers. The Law Governing the State Enterprise (Association) broadens the limits of self-management for the labor collectives. Seemingly, these processes should have a positive impact on the content of work done by the trade union organizations and their elective bodies.

In a self-critical vein, it must be said that the CPSU Obkom has not been able to achieve a decisive about-face on the given questions. Moreover, in a number of

instances formalism and passivity on the part of the trade unions has appeared starkly against this background, particularly in defending the interests of the workers.

Here is eloquent evidence from the statistics of reviewing labor disputes. In the current year alone, the number of persons rehired upon a court ruling increased by more than 20 percent, and in all instances the arbitrariness of the administration was carried out with the approval of the trade union committees.

During the current year there has been a significant increase in the number of letters to the party obkom concerning instances of a mass, unjustified reduction in the categories assigned to workers, the inflating of output rates due to transfers to the new job rates and salaries and at certain enterprises this has led to sharp labor conflicts.

We know of the events at the First Passenger Motor Transport Enterprise involving violating driver wages. The incident was widely taken up in the Leningrad press. There have been analogous instances in other transport organizations. In these situations, there has been virtually complete idleness on the part of the obkom of the trade union of motor transport and highway workers (chairman, Comrade N.I. Volkov). To one degree or another impotence is also characteristic of a number of other sectorial trade union obkoms.

Such a situation is linked to serious mistakes, training, placement and indoctrination of cadres in Lenoblsoprof [Leningrad Oblast Trade Union Council].

Self-critically, it is essential to also speak of the insufficient party support for the restructuring process in the trade union organizations. We might remind the delegates that there are over 100,000 communists in the elective trade union bodies. The party committees must channel their efforts into increasing the role of the trade unions in the production and sociopolitical life of the labor collectives.

In the course of implementing the economic reform, the people's controllers must provide a dependable shield against departmental, group interests, wastefulness and mismanagement. It must be pointed out that recently they have intensified their activities in these areas. To a definite degree this has also been aided by the critical comments directed at the oblast people's control committee at the obkom plenum in the bureau's report.

The formation under the committees for councils for coordinating control and auditing work has provided a substantial reduction in the number of audits and has increased their effectiveness. The people's controllers have disclosed serious shortcomings in the organization of production and price formation as well as in the expenditure of material resources. Their impact on solving social questions has increased.

It is essential to further activate control, particularly in the inferior levels, having focused it predominantly on preventing factors which give rise to mismanagement and waste.

During the report period the party obkom consistently carried out a line of strengthening the party ranks, purging them of unworthy members and increasing the demands placed on those joining the CPSU.

In accord with the decree of the CPSU Central Committee on the state of this work in the Tashkent oblast party organization, specific measures were undertaken to eliminate excessive organization, formalism, various allocation schedules and control figures. Glasnost has increased in recruitment into the party, the opinion of the labor collectives is widely considered and the candidate period has been made fuller and more meaningful.

You have, comrades, a detailed analysis of the movement of the membership of the Leningrad party organization. As you can see, here one can also trace certain negative trends. This is primarily the noticeable decline in admission, particularly of workers, to the CPSU. Thus, during the current year, as a whole, the admission of candidates as party members has declined by one-third and for workers almost by one-half. More than one-third of the primary party organizations operating in the sphere of material production has virtually not replenished their ranks.

The largest number of such organizations is to be found in the Vsevolozhskiy, Luzhskiy, Tosnenskiy, Oktyabrskiy and Frunzenskiy Rayons (first secretaries, Comrades Ye.I. Glebov, V.A. Antonov, I.F. Khabarov, N.A. Ignatyev and M.I. Salayev).

In essence, lying behind this is the inability to work with specific persons, in particular, with those, for example, who prove active in the councils of the labor collectives and in the public organizations.

It is important not to forget our main imperative, the purity of the party ranks. For an absolute majority of the Leningrad communists, high exactingness and profound party conviction have always been and remain the measure of loyalty to the glorious revolutionary, combat and labor traditions of the Leninist bolsheviks.

We must furthermore unswervingly unite our ranks, assume an active, offensive position and interject into the social organizations a spirit of party exactingness, openness and principledness. It is essential to wage an uncompromising struggle against the violating of the by-laws which is still permitted by certain party members.

In eradicating such phenomena, there should be a further rise in the role played by the party control commission under the party obkom and the corresponding commissions on the spot. The recently occurring facts of the

submitting of requests to withdraw from the party require particular attention and serious analysis. In each specific instance it is important to disclose the true reasons for such actions. Here it is imperative to act openly, relying on the opinion of the primary party organizations and the labor collectives. Only then will there be the necessary results.

At present, the party commission under the CPSU Obkom is involved in the great and responsible undertaking of rehabilitating those unjustly repressed party members. We must thoroughly examine the validity of the charges brought against the communists in the 1930s and 1940s and in the beginning of the 1950s as well as over the so-called "Leningrad Affair." No petition from the friends and relatives of the victims should go unchecked. We must restore justice to all innocent persons.

Comrades! During the report period at the center of attention of the party obkom has been the carrying out of the line of the April (1985) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee for democratization and glasnost and restructuring in all spheres of social life.

The efforts being made have made it possible to a certain degree to advance social awareness along the path of democratic renewal, to establish a socialist pluralism of opinions and these are becoming visibly apparent in the fundamentally new ideological situation developing in the region.

The formation of this situation to an ever-greater degree is being influenced by the effectiveness of the numerous social organizations, amateur associations and special-interest clubs. In arising upon the initiative of the labor collectives and the various social strata of the population, these independent groups have substantially enriched our social life and have made it possible to take a new look at many acute problems in the socioeconomic development of Leningrad and the oblast.

The activeness of the public has contributed to a review of ecologically harmful plans and to strengthening the preservation of the architectural appearance of the city's historical center and has restored the concepts of mercy and humanism to our self-awareness.

Such qualities inherent to the Leningrad working class and intelligentsia as internationalism and a heightened feeling of mutual aid are fully apparent now during the tragic days for the fraternal Armenian people, when tens and hundreds of thousands of people are providing concrete and effective support for the victims of the unprecedented earthquake. In this one can see not only a noble act of goodwill but also a significant contribution to the practical affirmation of the principles of Soviet patriotism and internationalism and the struggle of the party in all the progressive social forces against national exclusiveness, localism and chauvinism.



The development of worker creative initiative has been largely aided by the improved system for providing information to the workers on the activities of the party, soviet and economic bodies as well as by establishing structures to study public opinion.

The new ideological trends and processes have brought about fundamental changes in the economy. This is the democratization of production life, complete cost accounting and self-financing, the lease contract, as well as the development of cooperative and individual labor activities.

The profound changes in the production relations, in the forms of ownership require a thorough analysis and an understanding of them as processes disclosing great potential opportunities for the socialist system.

It must be said that a number of practical questions related to the restructuring of economic relations have been perceived far from uniformly from the standpoint of the former deeply-rooted ideas.

It is impossible not to see, for example, that the introduction of internal cost accounting constantly collides with the economic and psychological unpreparedness of many of our economic leaders, specialists, engineers, technicians and workers. Wage leveling and the adherence to the command-arbitrary management methods are being eliminated slowly.

The party has established a theoretical concept of the all-round renewal of our socialist society. It is now essential to bring its profound meaning to all the communists and workers of Leningrad and the oblast. Restructuring has entered a phase where to an ever-greater degree there must be effective ideological support for the revolutionary changes being carried out.

The measures to implement the decree of the CPSU Central Committee on reorganizing the political education system have produced definite results.

On a democratic basis, there has been a change in its structure, the interests of the students have been considered, and an important role has been assigned to the independent study of the questions of philosophy, history and politics.

The political education club has prepared recommendations and curricula, it regularly holds roundtables, group and individual consultations for the ideological aktiv, and involves in this party and soviet leaders as well as prominent scientists and specialists.

The CPSU Obkom sees the main task in focusing its efforts on the unresolved questions for increasing the effectiveness of political education. And there are still many of these.

In a number of party organizations, the content of political studies and the reduced demands upon the party members for a thorough mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory have not contributed to increased self-awareness and creative activeness on the part of the communists. To a significant degree this applies to the collectives of such enterprises and organizations as the Tobacco Factory imeni M.S. Uritskiy, Construction Trust No. 4 of Glavleningradstroy [Main Leningrad Construction Trust] and the Leningrad Institute for Railroad Transport Engineers imeni Akademik V.N. Obraztsov.

The party organizations should proceed from an awareness that informative political studies must contribute to an active analysis on the part of the workers of economic and social problems, and act as an effective instrument in the struggle against conservative, bourgeois and nationalistic ideology. The latter is very important.

At present, one cannot help but note the attempts by certain political demagogues to heat up the socioeconomic and ideological situation. The leaders and activists of the negatively inclined organizations are endeavoring, in speculating on our difficulties, to depict personal ambition as new political thinking. Attempts are being made to establish "political parties" and an independent system of mass agitation work while "samizdat" literature is being published.

In the letters received by the CPSU Obkom, the people at times accuse us, the party members, of an inability to defend our stance and to give decisive battle to political adventurism. This is valid.

Demagoguery will receive a well-reasoned rebuff only where the party organizations are concerned with making certain that each communist has clear political convictions and the necessary knowledge on modern problems.

Many city residents saw with their own eyes how important was the word of the Kirov workers, when attempts were made to organize provocations during the launching of the cruiser "Avrora" after overhauls. And such instances are not isolated.

The rapid growth of the independent organizations which have their own ideas over various questions of social development has been linked with the growth of civil self-awareness and, under the conditions of democratization, is a natural process. Because of this we cannot agree with the viewpoint that has appeared that such phenomena represent a danger for the cause of restructuring. In this context, we must set out the principled position of the party obkom.

We must learn to show proper respect to various statements and opinions as this corresponds to our party's line for deepening glasnost and developing pluralism.

But all of this does not mean that we should passively accept the activities of those organizations and groups which propagandize ideas that are alien to socialism and hope to impose on our people views which do not meet their fundamental interests.

Unfortunately, there are also communists among those who share extremist and antisocialist slogans. And here there cannot be two opinions as such a position is incompatible with the calling of a CPSU member.

The questions of strengthening socialist labor discipline, legality and law and order merit particular attention on the part of the party organizations. Their acuteness has not lessened in Leningrad and the oblast.

The theft of state property, speculation and bribe taking as well as official abuses are not being checked with sufficient decisiveness and little is being done to bring out various wheeler-dealers in the cooperatives and in the sphere of the "shadow economy." A trend has appeared for an increase in the number of particularly dangerous crimes. In comparison with last year, there has been a noticeable drop in the level of exposing infractions of the law. There has been a decline in the struggle against loafing and drunkenness, particularly on the job.

At the beginning of the year, the Bureau of the Party Obkom reviewed the work of the party, soviet, economic and law enforcement bodies in Moskovskiy Rayon in the area of strengthening socialist legality and law and order. Not all the city and rayon party committees have drawn conclusions from the bureau's decree. At present, one cannot help but be concerned with the state of affairs in Kirovskiy, Tikhvinskiy, Krasnogvardeyskiy and Petrogradskiy Rayons (first secretaries, Comrades V.Ye. Kukushkin, A.D. Seliverstov, V.K. Borisov and Yu.V. Rakov). The day-to-day situation remains the most complicated there.

The party gorkoms and raykoms must constantly analyze the state of legality and law and order and be concerned with increasing the legal knowledge of the Leningraders. The laws approved by the extraordinary session of the USSR Supreme Soviet are the first important steps in carrying out the legal reform and in establishing a state of law. The oblast party organization must take a most effective part in carrying out this enormously important task.

The CPSU Obkom has managed important changes in the spiritual life of the Leningraders. There has been a noticeable revival in the dealings of the Leningrad intelligentsia with all other strata of the population, the contribution of the intelligentsia to the forming of new thinking has risen and participation has intensified in resolving many problems of major social importance.

Over the last 3 years, it has been possible to a certain degree to overcome the residual principle in allocating resources in the cultural sphere. We have completed the reconstruction of the Benois Building of the Russian Museum and a fundamental reconstruction of the State Hermitage is picking up speed. After repairs, the Apartment Museum of A.S. Pushkin will particularly attract visitors.

The reequipping of the Smolnyy Cathedral as a concert and exhibit hall will open up new prospects for the development of musical art. The establishing of the Museum of the Benois family in Petrodvorets can serve as an example of fruitful collaboration between domestic and foreign lovers of Russian art.

Upon the initiative of the party obkom, it has become a practice to have public approbation of the most important projects in the area of monumental architecture and urban development. In particular, a session was held of the obkom bureau together with the Executive Committee of the Leningrad Soviet and representatives of the public devoted to the problems of the reconstruction of the historic center of Leningrad, the shaping of the aesthetic milieu of the new rayons of the city as well as its artistic development.

Two new unions have been organized: theater workers and designers. Preparations are underway to publish the first issue of the magazine *Iskusstvo Leningrada*. The first books have come out which have been published at the author's expense.

There has been a significant public response to the musical and theater festivals held in Leningrad as well as the days of literature and art of our city and the Union republics.

However, the reform in the spiritual sphere is not occurring simply and uniformly. In the creative unions passions are aflame and often these are far removed from solving the urgent problems of restructuring and a consumer psychology has developed. An unhealthy moral and psychological situation has formed in the School imeni V.I. Mukhina, the Leningrad Organization of the Artistic Fund and the Theater imeni Leninskiy Komsomol.

Ideological and artistic mistakes can also be detected in the repertoire policy. The experimental theaters have sharply reduced the production of new performances. At the same time, ticket prices have unjustifiably been increased. At times, the streets and exhibit halls of the city are overrun with primitive shows portrayed as authentic art. However, such phenomena have not been given a skilled assessment by criticism and professional artists. Here the cultural institutions often act as dispassionate onlookers.

As was pointed out recently at a session of the CPSU Obkom Bureau, the cultural administrations of the executive committees of the oblast and city soviets (Communists G.S. Pakhomova and A.F. Malkov) in essence have abandoned control over concert activities. Numerous youth clubs and cooperatives have assumed the functions of the organizers of performances by popular performers under particularly advantageous conditions while the Lenkontsert [Leningrad Concert] Association has literally planned nothing. The culture sections of the rayispolkoms have not had any influence on the repertoire of the self-financing and cooperative video halls and cafes.

The party organizations of the cultural institutions and the creative unions should assume a more principled and consistent position on these questions, they should abandon closed-shop and clan positions and in fact be proponents of authentic art in the masses.

A stronger party influence in the spheres of literature, art and leisure is impossible without relying on the real and healthy forces of the creative organizations and without attracting in new people and the young creative forces. The bureau of the party oblast committee, having analyzed the existing situation, has outlined specific ways for actively involving the youth in the creative life of the city, correlating this with the demands of restructuring, democratization and glasnost.

In accord with the decisions of the February (1988) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, there has been a reorganization in the bodies of the public and vocational-technical education administration. Instead of three cumbersome structures, a city committee and an oblast administration have been set up. At present, the activities of the new bodies should be focused on a comprehensive solution to the questions of both general education and vocational training. It is essential to energetically remove the unnecessary departmental barriers, strengthen the constructive cooperation of the school and the PTU [vocational-technical school], broaden their rights in organizing the educational process, and make this more flexible and dynamic as has been demanded by the overall concept worked out by the congress of public education workers.

In the higher institutions of learning, fundamental training has been strengthened and there is a more humanitarian focus in instruction. The link of the VUZes with production and science is being broadened and deepened. Over 2,000 contracts have been concluded with enterprises and scientific institutions. These measures orient the training process at the needs of life, at satisfying the requests for specialists in professions in demand as well as strengthening the material and technical support for the educational system.

If we look at the course of the restructuring in higher education as a whole, it can be concluded that the party organizations, the gorkoms and raykoms in this area are

still far from authentic restructuring. As can be seen from the report at a session of the Bureau of the Party Obkom in Oktyabrskiy Rayon (first secretary, Comrade N.A. Ignatyev), the style, forms and methods of its cooperation with the VUZes have not undergone major changes and are still far from the ideas of the reform. The state of affairs has been poorly analyzed and there has been a noncritical assessment of the quality of training for future specialists and their conformity to the demands of scientific and technical progress.

The CPSU Obkom is initiating measures to decisively overcome such a situation. It is a question of preparing an immediate reserve for production organizers for many national economic sectors. The state importance of this task should also determine the attitude of the party committees to it.

In the near future, a number of major problems must be settled in the educational sphere. First of all, it is essential to have a detailed concretization of the overall concept for ongoing instruction in terms of the requirements of the Leningrad region. We should have a comprehensive program for training, for advanced training, retraining and the employment of engineers, technicians and worker personnel in Leningrad and the oblast considering the long-range prospects for establishing the needs and the demographic situation.

The task is a far from simple one. For solving it, the executive committees of the Leningrad and city oblast soviets must draw in the best forces of the planning bodies, the scientific institutions and the national economic specialists.

The indoctrination of the younger generation is an inseparable element in the political work of the oblast party organization. The youth who comprise one-fifth of the population of Leningrad and the oblast are one of the most dynamic forces for restructuring.

Self-critically, it must be recognized that as a whole there are numerous flaws, mistakes and outright shoddy workmanship here. The crime rate among juveniles has not declined. Far from all parents are concerned with the fate of their children. The indoctrinational function of schools has been extremely narrowed. Work with the youth has become largely formal in the subunits of the Leningrad Military District and the Northwestern Border District, the naval base and the DOSAAF organizations.

In recent years, there has been a marked swing toward leisure. This, of course, is essential for young people. However, it is clear that ultimately the question of the political and moral development of the young person is not to be resolved in this sphere.

The party organizations, the Komsomol and the pedagogical personnel have lessened the attention paid to the labor and patriotic indoctrination of the youth. Suffice it to say that in recent years there has been a sharp decline in the influx of Leningrad youth into the sphere of material production.

Among young workers, there are more violations of labor discipline and personnel turnover is high. The grades of school children and students are declining. There have been more frequent instances of refusing to carry out the Law Governing Universal Military Service.

Our times place particular importance on developing a correct historical awareness in the youth. No matter how severe the lessons of the past, the youth must be raised on them. We have much to be proud of and much to say on the heroic accomplishments of the people during the difficult years of the establishing of the socialist state. It also must not be forgotten that history is also the today which can teach us a great deal. The propagandizing of historical knowledge should be based upon a profound ideological basis and on our revolutionary, military and labor traditions. Here the oblast party committee is counting firmly on an activist position in the collectives of the social sciences chairs of the Leningrad VUZes as well as on the effective help from the party, war and labor veterans councils.

The entire range of youth problems should primarily be in the field of activity of the Komsomol committees.

Positive changes are occurring in this largest youth organization and there has been a turn toward the real questions in the sphere of material production and ideology. The system of youth scientific-technical creativity is gaining strength. For further development it is extremely important to purge it of the obvious "commercial" spirit and the various sorts of wheeler-dealers who are endeavoring to use this youth movement in their own selfish aims which are far distant from the problems of science and technology.

The work of the Komsomol committees with the young deputies has been strengthened and professional contacts with the soviet commissions have been broadened and this has helped to develop initiative in the construction of youth housing developments and in the founding of cultural centers and political clubs. All these sprouts of the new merit the closest attention and support.

At the same time, as yet many Komsomol organizations have not become the true vanguard of the youth in the process of renewal in all spheres of social life.

They particularly need constructive support from the party committees and bureaus. The main demand in this area, as was pointed out at the 19th All-Union Party Conference, is to restore the Leninist traditions of leadership over the Komsomol. It is essential to put an end to the command style in the work with the Komsomol

committees and bureaus and eliminate the petty interference in their work. These relations should be based on the principles of professional collaboration, comradely advice and mutual aid. We feel that the question can be correctly posed as follows: at present each communist is fully responsible for the indoctrination of the younger generation.

The organizing role of the mass information media to an ever-greater degree is becoming apparent in all areas of forming social self-awareness as well as developing glasnost and democracy.

The thorough discussion at a session of the party obkom bureau concerning the work of the Leningrad Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting (chairman, R.V. Nikolayev) has become an important guide for the media's further addressing the practical tasks of restructuring in socioeconomic and spiritual life. The objective and demanding analysis of the existing situation made it possible to draw a number of fundamental conclusions. The essence of them is that in the presence of undisputed successes which have contributed to the greater popularity of many radio and television programs some of them still lack a profound penetration of the subject and a clear tuning to a constructive wavelength. In individual authors one can clearly trace a fondness for sensation and at times for tendentiousness in presenting the facts.

In taking up the complex and contradictory sociopolitical processes and phenomena of modern times, it is not enough to have a superficial outside view. There must be a clear party position on the part of the journalist, communist conviction and civil maturity, high professionalism and competence as well as responsibility for the content of the publications and programs.

The obkom bureau pointed to serious shortcomings in the indoctrinating of precisely such qualities in the work of the party organizations of the editorial collectives.

At present, there must be a qualitatively new approach to party leadership of the press. Even now the matter is often reduced to an abrupt response to journalistic errors and inaccuracies and to a desire to stifle criticism. The Vsevolozhsk, Lodeynoye Pole and Sosnovyy Bor city party committees have still not been able to establish professional working contacts with their press bodies.

The relationships of the press and the party committees must be established upon a common interest and any hint, let alone commanding tone are completely unacceptable in them. Both the party committees as well as the press, radio and television must be restructured. One of the ways for resolving these urgent problems is seen in establishing enlarged editorial bodies with the participation of the party and soviet aktiv, specialists and the public.



In carrying out the difficult tasks of directing social processes, including in the ideological sphere, it is essential to study closely and employ the experience of the fraternal parties. Proceeding from this, we must establish relations with our twin cities in a new manner and considering modern demands. Links with them must become as concrete as possible, even more mutually advantageous and aid the cause of restructuring and the strengthening of friendship and mutual understanding between our nations and peoples.

Comrades! The organizational-political and ideological work of the obkom during the report period has focused the party and Komsomol organizations, the soviet and economic bodies on carrying out the main task of the 12th Five-Year Plan stemming from the ideas of the 27th CPSU Congress, that is, at actually accelerating the socioeconomic development of Leningrad and the oblast.

The main areas in the activities of the Leningrad party organization have been shaped considering this and these provide an intensification of social production on the basis of the extensive introduction of the achievements of scientific and technical progress, the forming of a progressive structure and a qualitative renewal of the active portion of fixed capital and a substantial improvement in its utilization.

Fundamental changes are also being carried out in investment policy and in choosing its priorities. Particular attention has been given to overcoming the residual principle in the financing of the social sphere and environmental protection measures by reducing production construction, concentrating assets and capacity on the technical reequipping and reconstruction of operating enterprises.

Measures are being implemented to convert the labor collectives to full cost accounting and self-financing and to develop various forms of cooperatives and individual labor activities.

The mobilizing role of the party organizations and the intense creative labor by the workers, scientists, engineers, technicians and specialists from the various areas of the economy of Leningrad and the oblast have generally ensured the carrying out of the plan quotas for the current five-year plan.

The conference delegates have detailed data on this.

During the current five-year plan, the Leningrad economy has achieved a steady acceleration. This is a fact of fundamental importance. It has emerged from the complex, precrisis situation in which it found itself at the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s. To a significant degree this has been due to the broadened

scale of creating and introducing modern production methods and highly productive equipment, as well as to strengthening the role of academy, sectorial and VUZ science.

Over the last 3 years, the average annual growth rate of labor productivity in industry has risen by 1.7-fold while the drop in the return on investment has slowed down by almost 3-fold in comparison with the previous five-year plan. In the leading sector of machine building, over four-fifths of the certified products are produced with the state Quality Emblem, over one-third of the most important articles in the total production volume meets the world level or surpasses it, while the replacement rate for equipment, devices and instruments being produced has doubled.

The fact that the achieved increase in production to a definite degree has been attained on the basis of resource saving and in labor productivity by an absolute reduction in the number of workers objectively shows that the party and economic bodies have succeeded in strengthening the trend toward converting industry toward a more intensive path of development.

We would particularly point out that during this period the focusing of the economy on solving specific social problems was strengthened.

In accord with the demands of the party obkom plenum, there was a substantial increase in the amount of production of nonfood consumer goods. For the first time in the Leningrad economy a more rapid growth has been achieved in the output of these products in comparison with the overall increase in industrial production.

In the course of carrying out the quotas of the five-year plan, the CPSU Obkom has focused the efforts of the cadres on reviewing the priorities in the reallocation of capital investments. As a result, additional resources have been sought out for increasing the volume of completed housing, hospitals, outpatient-polyclinical and children's preschool institutions as well as general education schools.

The intense quotas of the Food Program have been at the center of attention of the party and soviet bodies. With the rise in the overall volume of agricultural production, the socialist obligations were overfulfilled by the oblast's workers in selling livestock products to the state.

However, in objectively assessing the development of the Leningrad economy from the standpoint of the requirements of restructuring, it must be pointed out that the achieved results are rather a positive trend than a fundamental change based upon the official use of all the profound factors of acceleration.

Understandably, a revolutionary breakthrough in the socioeconomic development would be impossible without a broad reequipping of production with modern

technology and this naturally requires time and the necessary resources which are still in short supply. Under these conditions, the CPSU Obkom has oriented the party and trade union organizations, the soviet and economic bodies at a comprehensive approach to renewing the structure as well as to modernizing and intensely utilizing the active portion of the current fixed capital.

Considering the decree of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers on the initiative of the Leningrad oblast party organization to further intensify industrial production in the city and oblast and to convert to two-shift operations, the party obkom at the outset of the five-year plan set out the primary political organizational measures to actually carry out this major national economic task in the region.

The high effectiveness of the designated direction for intensification is persuasively confirmed by the experience of the leading machine building enterprises such as Znamya Oktyabrya [October Banner], Lenpoligrafmash [Leningrad Printing Machine Building], Izhorskiy Zavod [Izhorsk Plant], Russkiy Dizel [Russian Diesel] and a number of other associations.

For example, the consistent carrying out of this line by the party organization at the Proletarskiy Zavod [Proletarian Plant] Association has had a profound positive effect on accelerating a rise in the technical level of production and the quality of the produced products.

In the areas freed of superfluous equipment they are carrying out comprehensive modernization and measures are being implemented to improve the working and service conditions for the workers. On this basis the collective has steadily ensured an average annual growth of labor productivity amounting to 8 percent.

The work being done has altered the attitude of the economic leaders, the specialists and all production workers to the utilization of fixed capital. A majority of the enterprises has abandoned the practice of acquiring new equipment "for reserve" and the machine tools and production lines are better loaded. The shift factor for highly productive automated equipment has reached 1.7 and at 40 percent of the enterprises is over 2. For the first time over the last 10 years, the absolute decline in the total fleet of production equipment has been almost 8,000 units while previously this increased annually by an average of 25,000-30,000 units. The freed hundreds of thousands of square meters of production area are being employed to resolve acute social and everyday questions.

At the same time, one cannot help but notice that many economic leaders and party organizations continue to underestimate the political significance of carrying out the major economic task and they show unacceptable passivity and slowness. This was convincingly shown by a study of the state of affairs at the enterprises in

Zhdanovskiy, Petrogradskiy and a number of other rayons, where the measures being carried out in the labor collectives do not produce the desired results.

As a result, for the region as a whole, the planned rate of replacing the machine tool fleet has not been achieved. At many enterprises the existing capacity as before is employed unsatisfactorily. The presence of surplus equipment has a negative effect upon the financial status of the collectives.

At present, almost 60 percent of the enterprises and organizations in industry, the agroindustrial complex, construction, transportation, communications, trade, science and consumer services are operating on cost accounting in the region.

As is known, next year the entire national economic complex of the city and oblast will be operating under the new economic conditions.

The course of the preparations for the next major step in restructuring the economic mechanism has been closely controlled by the CPSU Obkom with the calling in of leaders from the soviet and economic bodies as well as responsible representatives from the ministries and departments.

A thorough analysis has again persuaded us of the need for restrained assessments of what has been done. In spite of the fact that enterprise independence has increased, the level of contractual discipline has risen, the growth rate of labor productivity and profits have increased, the effectiveness of the new economic methods is still far from sufficient. The introduction of these in industry and in the agroindustrial complex, in the service sphere and transportation and in sectorial and academy science is being carried out in a difficult and contradictory manner. This situation is explained in part by the time factor and by the overall state of the economy.

However, we feel that the main reason lies elsewhere, in the incompetence of a number of the party, trade union and economic leaders as evidenced in their attempts to resolve this exceptionally complex and central problem of the economic reform.

The discussion at a session of the obkom bureau of the political organizational work carried out by the Kalininskiy Party Raykom (first secretary, Comrade V.N. Ivanov) to ensure the preparation of the enterprises to convert to the new management conditions disclosed significant forces of inhibition which hindered economic restructuring.

In the first place, there still is the continuing administrative dictating of terms and this does not make it possible to broaden the independence of the subdivisions in choosing the optimum ways for carrying out production and social tasks. In other words, the party

organizations have been unable to have the leaders delegate the obtained rights downwards, that is, into the shops, the sections and brigades.

Secondly, the radical economic changes and the new principles of encouraging labor have inevitably led to a decline and elimination of many surplus managerial elements and this has frightened a certain portion of the specialists and leaders, particularly those who are used to a calm life under the conditions of a guaranteed wage fund.

For these reasons the most progressive expenditure-fighting forms of internal production cost accounting are developing very slowly and these with correct application even in the first stage provide an explosive effect in results. This is proven by the practices of many leasing collectives in the various sectors of the national economy.

Economic methods are being efficiently introduced in the Svetlana and Zavod imeni M.I. Kalinin Associations, LenNIIkhimmash [Leningrad Scientific Research Institute for Chemical Machine Building], the Spirinskiy Sovkhoz and at the Krasnaya Slavyanka Experimental Subsidiary Farm.

However, the obkom, the party raykoms and gorkoms have still not done everything essential to widely disseminate this experience. The collective, family and individual leasing contract is being little introduced in the agroindustrial complex, construction, trade and consumer services.

One cannot help but see that the implementing of these progressive forms has constantly encountered the economic unpreparedness of a significant portion of our economic leaders, managerial personnel and workers. Many of them lack socialist entrepreneurship, initiative and the ability to assume responsibility. Such leaders can never lead restructuring either at an enterprise, in a shop or in a brigade.

There is the urgent question of having Lenoblsovprof organize a system of production and economic training for workers and specialists elected to the councils of the labor collectives and primarily for their chairmen. The lack of such training impedes the effective realization of the workers' rights and powers granted by the USSR Law Governing a State Enterprise (Association) and impedes the broad development of self-management and the carrying out of the key socioeconomic tasks.

The new economic mechanism, in being based upon economic management methods, has raised the question of strengthening the horizontal ties between the region's enterprises, science and production. Precisely this is the purpose of the two large intersectorial state associations in the power machine building and chemical area—Energomash and Tekhnokhim—and which were set up

upon the initiative of the CPSU Obkom and the economic leader group in accord with the decree of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers in Leningrad.

In the opinion of the party obkom, such fundamentally new organizational structures, considering the existing strong industrial and scientific-technical potential of Leningrad and the oblast, have great prospects in ensuring technological breakthroughs in the main areas of scientific and technical progress and the accelerated development of competitive products.

Thus, an important step has been taken in overcoming the departmental dictating of terms and isolation. New, creative relations and ties are being established, and the functions are being elaborated both of the associations as a whole as well as the independent, equal self-supporting collectives. All of this requires time, however we must not draw out the process. The party organizations should see and consider that here not everything goes smoothly. The process of adaptation is being carried out in a varying manner and this is understandable. In the activities of the enterprises comprising the MGO [intersectorial state association] there is no coordination, a number of organizational problems has not been solved and one can see no positive impact of the boards on the elaboration of an effective and promising technical and financial policy.

Recently, a decision was taken to establish councils for the party organization secretaries of the intersectorial associations. It is very important that from the first day of work their attention be focused on the key questions in the organizational development of the new structures, their rapid socioeconomic development and the forming of an effective cadre policy.

On its behalf, the CPSU Obkom will provide the party organizations at the enterprises and organizations making up the MGO with help in widely involving the communists and the labor collectives in carrying out these priority tasks.

The party obkom has also supported the initiative of a number of labor collectives in the construction organizations for setting up a unified regional managerial body, a construction committee, in Leningrad and the oblast. It, like the intersectorial associations, will most fully embody the principles of managerial democracy and the strengthening of the economic independence of the main production elements.

Presently, the central state bodies are examining the legal and organizational questions related to this. The establishing of such a territorial body is most closely linked by the party obkom with a quicker solution to the acute problems building up in the construction area and directly influencing the rate of carrying out many current and long-range programs which are vitally important for the Leningraders.

Recent years have seen the practical embodiment of the line of the oblast party organization of widely employing new opportunities to establish direct foreign economic ties and for organizing joint enterprises. A number of such firms already exists including the Soviet-West German Lenvest, the Soviet-Finnish Konsofin and others. It is important to emphasize that the foreign economic contacts are being established not only in industry but also in trade, consumer services, public dining, construction, science and other sectors.

At the same time, here one can also feel an inertia of thinking, a lack of initiative on the part of the soviet and economic cadres and the lack of a real mechanism for coordinating foreign economic activities. This impedes their further development and undermines confidence in us on the part of overseas partners.

The corresponding commissions organized under the Leningrad and oblast executive committees are working feebly, without proper entrepreneurship and as a result of this, regardless of the decision of the USSR Council of Ministers, up to now they have not organized, for example, the Leningradimpeks [Leningrad Import-Export] Foreign Economic Association.

At present, when the soviets have been given real rights to manage economic activity, it is essential to bear in mind that initiative and responsibility for broadening mutually advantageous foreign economic ties belong completely to them alone. In extensively using the rich opportunities of the new economic mechanism, the state institutions can and should make a major contribution to accelerating the development of the entire national economic complex.

The party and trade union organizations, the soviet and economic bodies must proceed from the view that the end result of the changes in the economic sphere is the fullest satisfying of the demands of the workers for food, housing, goods and services.

The people are expecting real improvements and everything must be done so that they feel these as quickly as possible. This is the fundamental position of the party obkom. The most important questions of the Food and Housing Program, of increasing the output of consumer goods and services and improving the ecological situation have been thoroughly examined at the plenums and sessions of the bureau and secretariat and in the Council for Economic and Social Development and the Acceleration of Scientific and Technical Progress Under the CPSU Obkom. Concrete measures have been outlined for their rapid resolution. In particular, there are plans to significantly broaden the contribution of machine building and other enterprises in the technical reequipping of the commodity-producing sectors.

It must be particularly emphasized that all the initiatives and proposals of the Leningrad party organization and the local soviet bodies on these priority problems have

been given complete understanding and constructive support on the part of the party Central Committee and the government. In particular, the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have adopted decrees on the accelerated reequipping of enterprises in light industry, on protecting the environment in the area of Lake Ladoga and the Neva Gulf as well as converting a number of harmful types of production. For improving the food supply of the Leningraders, the government, at the request of the Leningrad Gorispolkom has allocated additional funds for milk, meat, eggs, vegetables and potatoes.

In a word, at present we can firmly tell the Leningraders: the main paths have been tested out, the actual means have been determined and the essential resources have been calculated for carrying out the primary tasks in the social sphere.

Presently, everything depends upon the ability of the party, trade union and Komsomol organizations and the soviet and economic bodies to set up a clear organization of things and the concrete fulfillment of the outlined immediate tasks. This must be emphasized again and again, as repeatedly the good intentions of a portion of the cadres, in not being backed up by tenacious and intelligence organizational work, have been doomed to empty phrases. And worse than this, to a loss of time and resources.

What, for example, has prevented the Leningrad Gorispolkom for establishing in the new construction areas an extensive network of built-in or separate-standing small stores to sell bread, milk, vegetables and other food products? What is preventing the dissemination of the experience of many labor collectives of setting up the same stores, order desks and prepared food sections directly at the enterprises and organizations? The answer must be sought in the passive, unenterprising and, at times, irresponsible attitude on the part of a number of the soviet and economic leaders party committee and bureau secretaries and chairmen of the trade union committees for their direct and primary duty of being concerned for others. Only a lack of concern for man can explain the fact that with relatively sufficient amounts of food products the lines have not been reduced in the city stores.

In the existing situation it is essential that the Leningrad Gorispolkom in the immediate future implement the proposal of many Leningraders of turning over the management of the enterprises in trade, public dining and consumer services directly to the executive committees of the rayon soviets.

Since the start of the five-year plan, there have been significant changes in the agroindustrial complex. Its physical plant and social sphere have continued to develop and an organizational restructuring has been

carried out. The oblast's first agroindustrial combine Tosnenskiy has been established. They have begun to introduce new economic methods, contract and leasing forms for organizing labor.

The potential of the Leningrad machine building enterprises has been widely tapped in creating a range of modern, highly-productive, soil-tilling and harvesting machines and units. However, behind the scope of the problems being solved, problems which at first glance appear simple but in fact have long been primary have remained outside the attention of the CPSU Gorkoms and Raykoms, the city and rayon executive committees, the soviets and the economic leaders of the APK [agroindustrial complex].

Among these are such urgent ones as the storing, transporting and processing of agricultural products. The party obkom plenum and the sessions of the Leningrad oblast and city executive committees, having reviewed the course of implementing the Food Program, have outlined the ways for eliminating mismanagement and disproportions in storage and processing. The emphasis was placed on developing the appropriate physical plant directly on the sovkhozes with the active involvement of the industrial enterprises and the construction organizations of the city and oblast. In the near future this should provide an increase of 20 percent as a minimum in food resources out of their total production volume in Leningrad Oblast.

One other problem which is of concern to all Leningraders. This is the question of organizing a system of aid to the countryside using the forces of the urban dwellers. Let us, comrades, look at things realistically: the currently existing physical plant of the agroindustrial complex as yet cannot produce the required amount of food products without tapping additional manpower sources in the harvest season.

As was already pointed out, major measures in the rapid mechanization of agriculture in the region are already being carried out. This is one of the most important directions for technical support. But on the other hand, the designated problem as yet has not been completely resolved and we must learn to skillfully link the new cost accounting relations with the providing of effective aid to the sovkhozes. This should be based upon a contractual basis and efficient organization of things.

The most important tasks cannot be carried out without the most energetic and immediate involvement of the labor collectives. This concerns primarily a rise in the output of consumer goods and broadening the assortment of articles which are often the simplest but are in greater demand. Here an enormous field of activity opens up for the economic leaders.

Moreover, in virtually all the enterprises there are non-disposable items, surplus stocks of materials and unused capacity.

The role of the cooperative production movement on the basis of the USSR Law Governing Cooperatives is markedly growing in satisfying consumer demand. However, the Leningraders more often encounter high prices in the cooperatives than they do the required high-quality goods and services. There are virtually no cooperative bakeries, shoe and watch repair shops, that is, what is most needed.

Of the more than 1,000 cooperatives operating presently in Leningrad and the oblast, approximately one-half is in the service sphere and a little more than 20 percent in producing consumer goods.

In the initial stage of this movement the soviets showed inertia, timidity and inefficiency. What has changed now? Not a trace remains of the timidity but as yet organization and order have not been found. The operating areas of the cooperatives have not been clearly defined and financial control has been weakened. This cannot help but cause valid complaints from the Leningraders and most importantly does not contribute to the development of the actually useful and necessary cooperative structures.

The labor collectives should make a significantly greater contribution to the accelerated growth of housing construction. In September 1986, the Bureau of the CPSU Obkom, having reviewed the opportunities for housing construction, outlined a plan to expand this in Leningrad and the oblast. On this basis, the executive committees of the oblast and city soviets worked out a comprehensive program entitled Housing-2000. A very important task was set for the current five-year plan, namely to put around 230,000 apartments into use.

The adopted measures have made it possible as a whole to increase the volume of completed housing, to improve the quality of construction and better integrate the development. An example would be the two housing projects in the area of Lake Dolgoye. There are new incentives for erecting housing by the direct labor method. We have in mind the initiative of the labor collectives of Energomash [Power Machine Building] and Technokhim [Chemical Engineering], the Baltic Motor Navigation Company, Kirovskiy Zavod, Elektronmash [Electronic Equipment], Burevestnik and other associations which on a joint-stock basis have set up a construction design association. There is also the issue of broadening site-cast and individual housing construction.

In solving the housing problem, the party organizations should focus the economic leaders, the councils of the labor collectives and the trade union organizations not only on employing traditional methods but also providing the broadest support for the incipient new approaches as well as decisively eradicate bureaucracy and red tape in this important matter.



Comrades! Ensuring a determining influence by the party organizations on further deepening the restructuring processes to a decisive degree depends upon the accuracy of choosing the priorities on which the efforts of all communists must be concentrated.

During the period of preparing for this conference this work was carried out involving the broad aktiv of scientists and specialists. The main proposals which the CPSU Obkom has raised for discussion by the conference delegates come down to carrying out a strong social policy which in fact would help to raise the standard of living of the population.

In first place is a substantial acceleration in implementing the Food and Housing Programs, the dynamic development of the transport systems and roads, public health, education and culture and an improvement in environmental protection. Particular attention is to be paid to carrying out the range of measures to restore the cultural and architectural monuments and to recreating the historical appearance of the center of Leningrad and other areas.

Analysis indicates that the achieving of the set goals entails a significant increase in the amount of nonproduction construction and a radical reduction in the building of new industrial projects by reconstructing and technically reequipping the existing enterprises. Up to one-half of the total volume of capital investments must be assigned for nonproduction construction with the current 32 percent.

It is perfectly obvious that the strengthening of the social focus in the region's development depends totally upon the successes in the economy. The party committees must focus their energy on the political and organizational support for the quotas of the 12th Five-Year Plan, on the ubiquitous introduction of cost accounting and self-financing and on modern forms for organizing and encouraging labor. Even in the near future the management structures of the soviet and economic bodies will assume a complete form and an optimum model will be found for territorial economic accountability.

A most important task which requires unflagging party attention remains the accelerating of scientific and technical progress on a basis of implementing the territorial-sectorial program Intensification-90.

Concern must also be shown for the more distant future: in accord with the General Plan in the new year we must complete working out an overall concept for the socioeconomic development of Leningrad and the oblast for the period up to 2005, the main directions for the 13th Five-Year Plan and the Program Intensification-95. The party, soviet and economic bodies, in following these strategic documents for us, should unswervingly carry out a policy of a major about-face in the economy to serving the fundamental interests of the workers and each man.

Major steps have been outlined in the further development of the processes of democratization and glasnost. There will be more open and accessible information on the activities of the party and soviet bodies, the public organizations and primarily the oblast, city and rayon party committees. This must be viewed as the prime condition for increasing their role and importance as bodies of collective political leadership.

It would be wise at the first obkom plenum after our conference to review the question of forming the obkom commissions the activities of which would aid in the more complete restoring of Leninist principles and standards in the discussion and approval of decisions.

Such commissions could, in drawing on scientists and specialists, party and soviet workers and representatives of the community, thoroughly study the most significant problems in restructuring prepare constructive proposals and submit these for discussion to the CPSU Obkom, analyze and generalize the experience of the party leadership.

It is important as never before in the entire oblast party organization to strengthen the situation of friendly, collective and energetic work, and make the forthcoming report period full of specific deeds to carry out those tasks which confront the Leningraders. The party committees in the near future must carefully analyze the results of the reports and elections and outline a plan of actions with the establishing of the priority areas and provide the inferior party bodies with specific assignments so that each shop party organization, party group and each communist knows, as they say, precisely their actions, role and place in restructuring. Such assignments should also be set for the soviet institutions, economic and management bodies and social organizations, establishing strict supervision over their implementation and systematically providing a party assessment for the state of fulfillment.

Obviously, there must be a revision of the structures of the procedural council under the CPSU Obkom, the party gorkoms and raykoms. They must be made more mobile and focused on an end result. Then the experience of the party committees meriting attention will effectively be made available to all the party organizations of Leningrad and the oblast. It is time to organize the regular publishing of procedural materials and on a planned basis put out collections on the problems of party development.

The indoctrinating of political culture, the mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory and the dialectics of revolutionary renewal, and the creative application of the party's strategic ideas to carrying out the tasks of restructuring all spheres of social life—this is the most important aim in the ideological activities of the party organizations.

With the aid of the press, there is an opportunity to widen further the limits of information available to Leningraders on everything of interest to them. For this purpose, under the CPSU Obkom, we must set up a press center as well as work out a mechanism for shaping public opinion as a whole.

A great responsibility rests on the party gorkoms and raykoms, the leading communists of the local soviets, the economic and law enforcement bodies for universal legal education. The party obkom should become the organizer of skilled scientific and practical support for the legal reform in close linkage with carrying out the priority political and socioeconomic tasks.

Unacceptable is the slow rate in the restructuring of the higher, general educational and vocational schools. The responsibility for this rests primarily with the party organizations and the administration of the institutions of learning. But the party committees must also increase the responsibility of the soviet and economic personnel for the state of the physical plant of the schools, the PTU, technical schools and VUZes in being guided by the program worked out by the Leningrad Gorispolkom for their development up to the year 2000.

The changes in the cultural sphere presuppose a spiritual enrichment in the way of life of the Leningraders and the acquainting of them with the inexhaustible treasure-house of art which we possess. The long and fruitful activities of the seminar of leaders of literary and artistic institutions under the Leningrad CPSU Gorkom should be supplemented by the conducting of united plenums for the city organizations of the creative unions. It would be a wise thing to restore the seminar of literary and artistic criticism under the party gorkom and with its help deepen the dialogue between the leaders of the party committees and the literary and artistic workers.

At present, the preserving of the monuments of history and culture is assuming particular significance. Without this it is impossible to add to our great domestic artistic, musical and literary heritage.

The forming of the aesthetic environment in the new rayons of Leningrad requires serious practical measures. This is a matter of particular importance for the Main Directorate of Architecture and Urban Development, the Leningrad architects, artists, and the community represented on the councils under the Leningrad Gorispolkom.

In resolving the social problems which have built up, it is impossible not to consider that a significant portion of them involves the lives of such categories of Leningraders as the party, war and labor veterans, orphaned children and others. In the next few years, we must make noticeable progress in providing them with complete aid. There must be all-round support for the initiative,

undertakings and constructive proposals from such public movements as charity, the Children's Fund as well as organizations of the veterans, women and youth.

From all points of view it would be just to assign the Leningrad Gorispolkom, together with the Leningrad Council of War and Labor Veterans and the Leningrad Charity Society to examine the question of organizing homes for the elderly in each rayon of Leningrad and in the oblast and these would be primarily for persons alone, creating an atmosphere of care and attention in them. The party committees and organizations should institute effective supervision over the unconditional support for carrying out the designated plans and programs so that with each passing month and year the constantly new good results of restructuring become visible to the people.

Comrade delegates! In presenting for your review the report of the party obkom, I would like to point out that the current membership of the obkom has been working in an exceptionally important and crucial period in the life of our party and state.

In summing up certain results, it can be said with confidence that the Leningrad party organization and its oblast committee, in relying on the enormous experience and glorious traditions of the working class and the representatives of the elder guard of communists as well as with the active support of the scientific, technical and creative intelligentsia, as a whole, have met the tasks set for them.

Responsible and difficult tasks have rested on the shoulders of the current membership of the party obkom. In collectively analyzing the course of restructuring, the members and candidate members of the obkom and the members of the auditing commission have worked steadily so that the contribution of the Leningraders to accelerating the nation's socioeconomic development be, as always, substantial and proper.

There can be no doubt that the delegates will assess in a demanding and strict manner all that has been done by the party obkom, they will make constructive proposals and outline measures to improve its activities. Such an approach is dictated by the scope of the tasks involved in a further renewal of Soviet society and by the necessity of increasing the party's role as the vanguard of socialist development in the stage of practical actions and in the key areas of restructuring.

The deepening of the revolutionary processes and the radical changes in the economy, politics, social practice and in ideological relations pose fundamentally new tasks for the party organizations and communists.

The November (1988) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, in continuing the line of democratizing the electoral process, has set the goal of drawing on all forces to assist in forming a group of deputies in the soviets which could actually defend the fundamental interests and needs of the workers.

The new conditions under which the elections to the democratic bodies will be held will not only stir up the healthy forces of society but also, probably, will evoke activeness by those who endeavor to actually impede restructuring. We cannot and will not permit such a turn of events and each and every one must be clearly aware of this.

The party committees in the existing situation must:

- Head the process of uniting the efforts of all supporters of renewal;
- Assist in promoting to the soviets the most worthy representatives of the bloc of communists and non-party persons;
- In a complete and accessible manner explain the domestic and foreign policy of the party, the purpose of the economic and political changes being carried out, speak to the people and defend the truth, without avoiding acute questions;
- Constantly channel the growing political initiative of all honest persons into the stream of practical undertakings and make it understood that only by common efforts and by a high output in each job is it possible to solve the problems of accelerating socioeconomic development.

Thus, and only thus, is it possible to most fully manifest the vanguard role of the party organizations.

The active position of the more than 600,000-strong detachment of Leningrad communists will assist in the actual implementation of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th All-Union Party Conference and will give new incentives to restructuring.

#### **Krasnodar Kray Officials Discuss Kuban Party Apparatus Restructuring**

*18000418 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Dec 88 p 3*

[Interview with I. Polozkov, first secretary of the Krasnodar CPSU Kraykom; N. Gritsenko, first secretary of the Krasnodar Gorkom; and R. Bagadirov, first secretary of the Teuchezhskiy Raykom, by PRAVDA correspondent K. Aksenov: "Restructuring and the Apparatus: Renovation"]

[Text] Krasnodar Kray—After PRAVDA's publication on 8 October of the report from the plenum of the Krasnodar Kray committee of the CPSU, which examined what is perhaps a fundamental question—the mastery of

political methods of management by party committees, letters came in to the newspaper's correspondents center from various parts of the country. Readers are interested in restructuring of the party apparatus and ask us to tell about the first experience and problems.

After picking out the most interesting, and sometimes the most pointed and unusual letters, I asked the first secretaries—I. Polozkov of the Krasnodar Kraykom of the CPSU, N. Gritsenko of the Krasnodar Gorkom, and R. Bagadirov of the Teuchezhskiy Raykom—to respond to them.

[Aksenov] In their letters, V. Sergiyenko from Lipetsk, Krasnodar resident S. Grigoryan and others ask you to clarify: How is the apparatus of party committees being restructured? Which departments are being abolished and which ones are being reorganized? Where are the employees who were dismissed going? The readers add in this case that they have heard that the reduction of the number of managers here and there is purely symbolic.

[Polozkov] I will say frankly that this work, which is being carried out in conformity with the decisions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the July Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, is not as simple as may have been indicated earlier. And it is understandable: this does not involve a mechanical change in department titles and reduction in staff. The task is more complicated here. In reducing the work force, we must develop a strong party apparatus at the same time which is able to master the management of restructuring by political methods and to activate the work of primary organizations in all sectors of the economy and in the social and other fields. After all, changes in the society's political system, the division of power, and the extension of democracy do not take away the party committees' responsibility for everything that is being done in the kray, city, rayon, or labor collective. It is rather just the opposite: the role of the party as the people's political vanguard is now increasing substantially. We are taking these circumstances into account in reorganizing the apparatus.

On the kraykom specifically. First of all, the departments of industry, construction, transport and communications, science and educational institutions, trade and everyday services, and a number of others have been abolished. Thus the sectorial principle, with its numerous card indexes and folders of reports, summaries and other attributes of its longtime formal office style is leaving, never to return. And what is to replace it? Seven departments, half as many as before, have been organized in the kraykom. The staff is being cut back by 30 percent, or 43 employees. These are basically the heads of departments and their deputies, the managers of sectors and instructors. There are 105 persons remaining. By the way, when you cite this figure in a meeting with a party aktiv or in labor collectives, some even



question this. Are there really so few? they ask. After all, there are more than 320,000 communists in the kray party organization, and about 8,000 primary party organizations.

There is no question that under conditions of a sharp reduction in positions, it is not simple to organize a resly militant party headquarters capable of giving dynamism to restructuring and putting it on the offensive. These are the departments we now have in operation: party-organizational and personnel work, ideological, social and economic, agrarian, state and legal, and general. As we see, the changes in the directions of their work can even be noticed from their titles.

We were not indifferent to this problem before either, of course. A considerable number of interesting and instructive methods of work with personnel made their appearance in past years. But unfortunately, there is still no integral, really up-to-date system that has been reinforced by science and practice in this most important work, in my view. Much of personnel policy is still formalism, red tape, and various kinds of bureaucratic impediments. As a result, persons sitting in a manager's chair sometimes lack organizational abilities and party modesty. We recognize such persons and release them, of course, but restructuring suffers from the mistakes. And this should not be the case.

Other departments are also drastically changing the style and direction of their work in conformity with the decisions of the 19th Party Conference.

[Gritsenko] The staff in our gorkom is being cut back by 15 percent. Three sectorial departments are being abolished. Four departments are being organized under the new structure: organizational, ideological, social-economic, and general. And now we have only 29 employees left. You will agree that this is not many for a city with five party raykoms and 62,000 communists.

What do we consider the basis of the staff restructuring? We must decisively rid ourselves of the notorious bureaucracy and technocracy and stop idolizing its majesty of figures.

I will not conceal the fact that I have had occasion to hear that restructuring in the staff comes down to a simple rearrangement of personnel and "reshuffling" of positions. They say that persons are calmly going from sectorial departments into social and economic departments. What is the difference? they ask.

There is a big one. After all, the current reorganization presumes qualitative changes in party work and the mastery of new, political methods of management. Which means actively carrying out the party line after subordinating all the means of ideological-educational and organizational work and the will of communists to this. The allocation of functional duties is being changed substantially, beginning with the instructor and ending

with the gorkom secretary. The main point is that all questions, without exception, must be resolved now through the party organizations.

[Bagadirov] The size of the staffs in the party's rural raykoms, as well as the gorkoms with no rayon division, is not being changed. Frankly speaking, we have no one to cut back. We have just 15 employees. Not many changes in the structure, either. Out of four departments, we eliminated the agricultural department, and the general department became the record-keeping sector. So we have organized two departments—organizational and ideological,

In point of fact, we are faced with more extensive changes. The point is not the arithmetic and not who has taken over which position. The style of party work is being changed.

[Aksenov] V. Krutko from Krasnodar and other PRAVDA readers ask about the futures of party workers who were cut back.

[Polozkov] I will not maintain that this is a simple, painless process. No matter what is said, even the first secretaries of raykoms and heads of kraykom departments have to leave their posts. And as a rule, these are experienced, competent persons who have committed no offenses. And suddenly they are retired. All this must be taken into account, and we are trying to demonstrate thoughtfulness and sensitivity, although there probably is resentment. But I want to speak about another matter.

When the kraykom staff was still getting ready for restructuring, agricultural department instructors V. Ostapenko and G. Kholod did not bide their time, but asked to be sent into the rapids, as they say. The first one went to the Kolkhoz imeni Lenin in Pavlovskiy Rayon, where he began work, and the second one went to the "Primorskiy" Kolkhoz in Shcherbinovskiy Rayon. The stanitsa residents were pleased that the party employees did not hold on to their prestigious chairs and well-equipped apartments in Krasnodar during the important period of restructuring. They also believed in the interesting programs for renovation of the farms which these comrades suggested to them. For this reason, they were gladly elected chairmen of the kolkhozes.

Restructuring in the staff is as if our personnel are being tested for maturity. And it makes us happy that the majority of them have been able to overcome considerations about their career and personal well-being. Many have to leave the cities and their homes and take their family to a new place, look for work for the wife and put the children into kindergartens and schools. There are enough everyday problems associated with a move. But the communists are not grumbling.

[Aksenov] One more letter. Armavir resident I. Nagornyy writes: "Several years ago they organized two party raykoms in our city. It was considered a big

accomplishment at that time. And suddenly they are breaking them up now. Is it really impossible to understand that such reshuffling is harmful?"

[Polozkov] There really was such enthusiasm at one time—to divide a city into rayons and accordingly establish party, soviet and other organs with a considerable number of management personnel. There was also something else. In one city, let us say, the party's city and rural rayon committees, two ispolkoms, and so one were next to each other. A peculiar dual power took shape which resulted in many conflicts and internecine arguments. For example, some time ago unified party organizations were established in Tikhoretsk, Yeysk and Tuapse and the adjacent rural rayons. The advantage of such a structure is obvious. The cities help the village residents and vice versa. Another example. Things had not been going well in Kavkazskiy Rayon, which has the best opportunities to develop agricultural production. But they were short of manpower. At the same time, the lands in this rayon came up to the very outskirts of the industrial city of Kropotkin, where there was a critical shortage of food. A paradoxical picture took shape. The bureaucratic boundary disturbed the neighbors and they could not come to an agreement on harmonious work together. And then in the course of restructuring the party apparatus these party organizations were united.

The letter writer from Armavir is correct: division of a small city into rayons does not produce anything useful; it only increased the management apparatus and the paper flow. Is this really in the spirit of the time? They had to abolish the party's rayon committees after reinforcing the city committee.

#### **Tallinn Party Conference Concludes Reports-Election Campaign**

18000424 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA  
in Russian 21 Dec 88 p 3

[ETA report by R. Amos and F. Kaazik on conference of the Estonian CP Tallinn city organization, 16-17 December: "Only to Consolidate the Pledge of Success"]

[Text] ETA—The conference of the Estonian CP Tallinn city organization on 16 and 17 December ended the reports-election campaign in the republic's party organizations.

Tallinn's problems are in many respects Estonia's problems. One-third of the republic's population lives here; this is where one-third of its industrial potential is located and 42 percent of the republic's communists work. The various functions of the republic's capital, its social and nationality composition, the quality of life and certain other factors have exerted a steady influence on the ideological situation, the party and other organizations, and the different movements.

E.-A. Sillari, member of the Estonian CP Central Committee Buro and first secretary of the Tallinn Party Gorkom, delivered the gorkom's report.

Assessing the ideological work accomplished over the reporting period, he said that the contradictory nature and complexity of this period has to be understood. Ideological work remains the most important channel of communication between the party gorkom and the people. The spiritual potential of scientific institutions, higher educational institutions and creative unions is being drawn more and more extensively into this work and we have begun to rely on sociological research and expert assessments in working out ideological solutions. A new system is being organized for the ideological aktiv's instruction and information distribution. And timely and objective information hampers the spread of all sorts of rumors in the present ideological situation.

Speaking about the shortcomings in ideological work, E.-A. Sillari pointed to three reasons.

Firstly, orientation only to directives from above paralyzes many ideological workers, injures their authority and holds back their initiative. The shift to political methods of leadership requires persons who are capable of analysis, who possess speaking and writing skills, and who are able to orient themselves independently and effectively in different circumstances.

Secondly, many employees in the gorkom organization are overloaded with day-to-day work. This is because of the poor training and inability of personnel in both the gorkom and raykoms to respond to new occurrences, as a consequence of which the solution of all the problems of even the slightest importance are shifted to the shoulders of the party gorkom.

Thirdly, the consciousness of persons is being shaped primarily by irregularities in socioeconomic development and a decline in the quality of life. For this reason, ideological support for economic renovation and democratization of public life has to be of paramount importance in ideological work. The rapid increase in Estonians' national consciousness engendered by the process of restructuring has brought about the beginnings of a national movement. Unfortunately, it has been accompanied by both politically immature and irresponsible statements which have led to distrust and doubt among the Russian-speaking population. Many persons, including communists, have tried to identify the advancement of national factors to the forefront of political life as nationalism and to represent Estonians' aspiration to restore the republic's sovereignty as an attempt to secede from the USSR.

The new political situation, the public action by persons and their dissatisfaction with the situation in many areas of public life have shed light on the many shortcomings of the party-political and organizational work conducted previously and the weak points of all ideological work.

The authority of party organs and workers has declined. Even those individual gorkom employees who were able to analyze the situation and exert influence on persons' way of thinking have been unable to save it. The trust of the Popular Front, which emerged and became stronger under the crisis conditions, essentially became an alternative to the extreme movements, narrowed their social base, and reduced the danger of an expansion of antisocialist attitudes. We see one of the Popular Front's shortcomings in the fact that it was unable to attract the people of nonindigenous nationality. Although the goals of the Popular Front are not narrowly national, the movement became practically one of a single nationality all the same.

The International Movement emerged as a kind of counterbalance to the Popular Front position.

In giving an assessment of the International Movement, we have to acknowledge regretfully that its activity has not been conducive to the formation of a united front of restructuring forces in the republic and its capital. Fortunately, a certain evolution of views and tendencies is traced in the development of the ID [International Movement], dialogue is being planned with other political forces, and its assessments are taking local features and the common interests of all the republic's residents into account more and more.

The ecological crisis has created objective conditions for the emergence of the "Greens." Achievement of the objectives of the "Greens" movement and their dialogue with other movements and political forces depend to a large extent on the tactics chosen and the forms and methods of their activity. The tendency of the "Greens" toward excessive politization of their activity puts us on our guard at present.

The Movement to Preserve Monuments of the Past emerged as a natural reaction to the manipulation of history over the years and attempts to stifle historic remembrance. Unfortunately, the present stage of the movement, made up of a mixed group of people, is characterized by a certain idealization of the past, as well as by a number of other features which are probably associated with the "growing pains" manifested in radicalism. The replacement of one black-and-white historical outline with another one does not contribute at all to the restoration of objective and dialectically complex historical truth.

In speaking of the associations of labor collective councils, we have to mention their positive attempt to put together the efforts of labor collectives to resolve the socioeconomic problems of both the republic as a whole and individual cities and rayons. But at the same time, we cannot agree with the attempts to politicize these associations and attempts to replace or duplicate state and soviet organs.

The so-called Independent Youth Movement demonstrates that no one remains indifferent to restructuring. We are dealing here not with a unified movement that has been formed, but rather with a multitude of ideas and the categorical demand for the right to an independent decision in all world affairs. We are disturbed here by the fact that the Komsomol as a political youth organization is proving to be more and more aloof from youth movements, and this paves the way for the formation of youth groups on a purely national basis.

The report provided the party's assessment of press organs, the activity of the city Komsomol organization, and social and economic development. It provided self-criticism on the gorkom's work, the growth of party ranks, and the paths for further development of internal party democracy.

Representatives of the most diverse occupations—29 delegates—came to the rostrum to share their thoughts on the activity, present status, and future of the Tallinn city party organization. Many different views—at times opposing ones—were expressed. However, everyone was united in one opinion: consolidation is necessary.

It was stressed that our attention unfortunately has been devoted to consequences and not to the causes, and that we are debating what is taking place instead of finding out why it is taking place. The speakers emphasized that it is necessary to look for and find common ground, not to intensify the differences which we inherited from the times of Stalinism and stagnation. It was noted that we unfortunately still do not have a specific program and tactics for consolidation. The concept of "consolidation" continues to be only a slogan to a certain extent, all the same. First of all, protection of the environment and increasing the standard of living of Estonia's residents should become the common problems whose solution would establish a foundation for the consolidation of forces.

The IME [Self-Managing Estonia] was called upon to provide for their solution, but at the same time, the plans for the republic's cost accounting have to be adjusted toward reality; it is necessary to shift from the proclamation of goals and principles to the determination of specific steps.

In the view of the authors of these paragraphs, the idea stood out from the conference rostrum that it is time to stop discussions about Estonians and other nationalities, and that we are dealing with people first of all. For this reason, the criterion for joint activity should proceed from the following moral hierarchy: first, the person, secondly the Estonian resident, and only then some nationality.

The speakers called for an end to useless arguments and urged that they pass on to deeds. If we do not reach a turning point in the economy, restructuring will not take place. We must put an end to a negligent attitude toward

work, defective output in production, mismanagement, and other obstacles which impede the development of material and spiritual values.

The idea of conducting a comprehensive expert appraisal of all the economic projects, plans and programs that had been outlined was also expressed. It was stated that many good and necessary steps are being drawn out unacceptably in Tallinn thus far. Reconstruction in the Kalamay region, the lag in the social area and in building a theater, and so forth were mentioned as an example. In speaking of economic policy, the speakers sadly established the fact that the cost of living is rising and its quality is declining, and the existing wage system was criticized. A situation in which cooperatives have the ability to pay workers significantly more than state enterprises can lead to serious consequences.

One problem is our own inertia, the habit of thinking only in the old way, and another one is the bureaucracy, under the weight of which many persons think only about the paperwork aspect of a problem. In reality this is a much deeper problem. This is a person or group of persons who seized power which essentially did not belong to them. Unfortunately, labels of nationalism and chauvinism are often applied in the struggle against bureaucracy, regardless of whether this refers to local bureaucracy or the bureaucracy of the central government.

The process of restructuring should be reflected adequately in the press. This was the opinion held by all the speakers who touched upon the role of the mass media in our society. A pluralism of views became apparent in these discussions. Some approved of the journalists' work, but on the other hand, some blamed the republic's press for no longer being under the party's control. The need for sufficient information in the Estonian and Russian languages was stressed. It was suggested that the Estonian and Russian television news broadcast "Aktualnaya kamera" [Current Camera] appear as a single block and be accompanied by a simultaneous translation. It was noted at the same time that the press has overcome a certain euphoria lately and has become more businesslike and objective.

The different movements did not receive a common assessment at the conference, either. For example, it was noted that the Popular Front's leaders were not able to foresee those social processes which give rise to their activity, and it was precisely for this reason that the International Movement and the United Council of Labor Collectives emerged. The fact that the danger of incorrect understanding exists even when a translation is adequate was not taken into account, either. Hence the fear among some of the people with regard to their fate and the future of their children.

Most of the speakers also gave an assessment of the work of the party's Tallinn gorkom and its bureau. Basically it was evaluated as satisfactory. Nevertheless, the view was

expressed that the gorkom remained in the role of a detached onlooker in certain political events by giving them the chance to develop in a haphazard manner and without giving the party's assessment of them. However, it was noted at the same time that the gorkom's work style has become more businesslike and specific, taking the demands of the time into account.

Extreme points of view were also heard at the conference, but they met with no serious support among the delegates.

V. Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian CP Central Committee, addressed the conference. He said: "The conference is a special one, and to all appearances, each delegate should regard it with a feeling of particular responsibility—after all, it concerns the party organization of our republic's capital. It has been observed very correctly here that the importance of everything that has been said is not being reinforced tomorrow, but today. A great deal depends upon us in carrying out the ideology of restructuring.

"The basic productive forces of Estonia and the working class, in whose name persons who have nothing in common with the working class love to speak at times, have been concentrated in Tallinn. Our creative intelligentsia are represented at the conference and representatives of our scientists are here. Hence our responsibility in evaluating not only the work of the party's gorkom, but the work of every raykom and every primary organization. Please ask yourselves the question today: what have I done in the name of the ideology of restructuring?

"The Estonian CP Central Committee and our entire republic expect first of all that course of restructuring will not be limited to lofty phrases, the organization of meetings and forums, and the assignment of labels. After all, communists are taking part in all these occurrences we are speaking about here today. They are taking part in the Popular Front, the International Movement, and the "Greens" Movement as well.

"Beginning with the 10th Plenum of the Estonian CP Central Committee, we have conferred repeatedly with the communist leaders and active membership of these public movements.

"It is natural that the party's Tallinn Gorkom is responsible for the situation that has developed in the capital now. But after all, each communist who takes part in an informal movement is on the books first of all in a primary party organization, a party collective. We often forget that the party collective should exert influence on these leaders in the first place. Instead of this we wait for the party gorkom or someone else to change the situation. Let us be exacting in a party manner. To begin with, this means in practice that in the first place, radical economic reform should assume practical forms and the role of labor collectives and party organizations in this process should increase as well.

"Secondly, the process of democratization of our society should begin taking place in the first stage of political reform and restructuring of party life should be realized so that there is someone to be guided by in a labor collective, and not just someone to speak in the name of the collective. Thirdly, Leninist principles should begin to be applied in our relationships between nationalities, and at the same time, we should speak about these relationships precisely as they have to be understood, without shifting them artificially, and sometimes intentionally, to critical questions that have been accumulating for decades. I refer here to the extensive development of the economy, the ecology, the negation of Leninist principles in the development of national culture, and so forth. The 11th Plenum of the Estonian CP Central Committee tried to examine all these problems, and there is no doubt that we will be looking into them later on as well.

"A reform of public life and democratization is not a simple matter. This was demonstrated at the last session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. M. S. Gorbachev stated clearly at the November Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee that we had a great deal to learn in order to do this. Mistakes were made in the learning process, and we made them as well. We were rightfully reproached for these blunders at both the November Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, as well as after them. Let us be sensible and learn how to conduct our affairs better!

"I had occasion to speak at the November Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. I did this with a heavy heart, but honestly, after telling about all the sore points which, in my opinion, gave rise to the problems which we are discussing today, at times when not speaking on business.

"We need to determine our points of reference, proceeding from those positions which were defined at the 19th All-Union Party Conference. But let us not repeat these principles in the form of slogans; let us put them into practice by our daily work.

"We are speaking a great deal about the IME here today and realization of the radical economic reform. But I would like to point out that not one of the production managers and secretaries of party organizations has mentioned a word today about a serious problem: the reasons why over a period of 11 months in Tallinn, losses of work time increased by 28 percent, losses because of unauthorized absences from work increased by 29 percent, and losses of work time within shifts were doubled! How can we implement an economic reform in such a situation? I could cite other examples of this sort. Let us not forget the requirement set by the January Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee: each production manager is simultaneously responsible for the collective's economic activity and its ideological and moral appearance. We are inclined to forget about the first one as well as the second one from time to time.

"At the forthcoming plenum of the Estonian CP Central Committee, we will continue the principled discussion begun at the 11th Plenum of the Estonian CP Central Committee. The party should assume responsibility and initiative, beginning with each communist and each primary party organization and ending with the Central Committee. We will achieve nothing unless we increase the party responsibility of party members.

"Another point. When we refer to internationalism, I would ask communists to regard this word with a great deal of piety. The party has always acted exactly that way. Internationalism is not a slogan; it should be in one's heart, deeds, and morality of conduct. In life, our understanding of this concept is often oversimplified because we forget that an internationalist is one who thinks first of all about how to realize the ideas that are common to all mankind, which are the fundamental ideas programmed for our party."



**Development of USSR Into a Democratic System  
Seen as Lengthy, Difficult**

*18120057 Moscow XX CENTURY AND PEACE  
in English No 12, Dec 88 pp 22-25*

[Article by A. Migranyan: "Is It Easy To Become Europe?"]

[Text] Speaking at one of the most representative symposiums, with the participation of a galaxy of leading Western intellectuals, on problems of freedom at the beginning of World War Two, Italian philosopher Benedetto Croce accused the British of being partly responsible for the cheerless state of the world at that time. In the fact of advancing fascism, Croce reproached Britain with treating democracy as its national property, making no attempt to spread it throughout the world. Croce's speech shows the strength of prejudice, as if democracy can be exported. Decolonization in Asian, African and Latin American countries showed that politicians, too, have similar misapprehensions.

No country has yet painlessly carried out the transition from traditional absolutist-oligarchic systems to democracy. Lucky in this respect were Britain, Holland and North European countries, where the establishment of the values and institutions of liberal democracy took place harmoniously over centuries. For example, in Britain the struggle for the protection of personal and community rights from the arbitrary interference of Royal power can be traced back at least to the 12th century. The "glorious revolution" of 1689 and its relatively painless outcome for the British is explained by the fact that the revolution did not start but finished the struggle, that it was notification of the final victory of civic society over the state. The winner was liberal democracy whose core is the inviolability of all individual rights and liberties of each person.

But, attempts by 18th-century French society to make an immediate transition from one state to another, to put into practice a certain abstract scheme for organizing society for the happiness and freedom of all, ended with revolutionary terror and protracted wars. Tocqueville once wrote that French thinkers and revolutionaries had forgotten the old truth that attempting to achieve freedom immediately puts you on the path to slavery. France's transition to a democratic political system, started by the 1789 revolution, has practically continued through to the early 1980s, the 20th century, when the socialist, communist bloc came to power and cemented and imparted an Anglo-Saxon character to the French political system: a stable two-pole centre and small groups of radically-minded marginals on the right and left flanks of the political spectrum. But it took France nearly 200 years, incalculable revolutions, dictatorships, ochlocracies, replacement of monarchies with republics and vice versa.

Some other cultured peoples of Europe failed to move over to a stable democratic political system on their own. The attempts made over 40 years by the Kaiser's authoritarian regime in Germany to tame different class and social interests in the Reichstag did not produce the expected results despite the high economic and cultural development level of the German people. After the collapse of the authoritarian empire in 1918, German society went through a period of sharp social and class polarization. Things were aggravated by the world economic crisis—democratic values and institutions transplanted onto German soil, did not hold out. Polarization and radicalization of socio-political life in Germany led the country into chaos which gave rise to Right-wing totalitarianism: German national socialism.

The overall estrangement of the people from political power and property; society and the individual absorbed by the state; complete estrangement of citizens from the individual spiritual sphere as a result of its full estatization and regulation—all these take place under ideal totalitarianism. The boundary between political and non-political spheres of life vanishes, any form of unsanctioned vital activity is ruled out. There is no longer a problem of majority and minority: the law punishes dissidents and bans any minority. In their activity formally existing socio-political organizations are totally regulated by one state body or another. The totalitarian regime demands not only loyalty to itself but active manifestations of devotion and enthusiasm. As usual such regimes have no mechanism for handing over power, as a result of which transition of supreme power from hand to hand is fraught with political upheavals, behind-the-stage intrigues and coup d'etats.

There has been no example in history of a totalitarian political system peacefully developing into democratic system. The German totalitarian-authoritarian state was eliminated as a result of a military defeat, democratic institutions and values were forced upon Western Germany by the United States and its Western allies. Transition from an ideal totalitarian system to democracy cannot be accomplished in one "great leap". De-estatization of spiritual and then economic life, with institutional registration of various non-state forms of ownership, floods society with numerous conflicting interests. The polarization of interests increases the likelihood of chaos and the downfall of the political system, which is in the stage of radical restructuring. Therefore, while the process of revival of civic society in economic and spiritual spheres, unregulated by the state, is going on, it is very important that authoritarian power, which deliberately allows limited or guided democracy, should be preserved in the political sphere. But such a system enjoys confidence only when it is open. To prevent illusions and suspicions among the people, it is necessary for the authorities, conducting the reform, to speak for all to hear about the need for temporary bounds of democracy, and to explain the reasons for this. But, in this period, authoritarian power must be engaged in the creation of a democratic mechanism of power and,

gradually granting these democratic institutions rights and powers, adopt the role of arbiter and corrector. At this stage, the task of the authoritarian power boils down to ensuring the settlement of the conflict of interests in society through legal political institutions of people's power, so that the practice of a constitutional compromise becomes a habit for the sides shaping the people's culture and political life. The first steps in this direction are now being taken by the USSR, China and other socialist countries.

Since it is impossible to carry out transition to democracy from totalitarianism, by passing a pretty lengthy period of preserving the authoritarian regime, I think it is necessary to describe in brief the peculiarities of this regime and the features distinguishing it from totalitarianism.

The authoritarian regime usually emerges when the old socio-economic institutions of society are scrapped and forces polarized during transition from traditional to industrial structures. Operating under an authoritarian regime are certain elements of a democratic regime: elections, struggle between political parties in parliament and so on. However, the political rights of citizens and socio-political organizations are limited, serious legal opposition to the regime is banned, political conduct of individual citizens as well as political organizations is strictly regulated. As distinct from a totalitarian regime, authoritarianism allows doses of dissidence and cuts down legal opposition. As distinct from totalitarian, authoritarian regimes may evolve towards a democratic regime, as has happened over the past decade in Spain, Greece, Portugal and Latin American countries. The main reason behind such a relatively painless transition, which distinguishes an authoritarian from totalitarian regime, is the presence of a certain sphere of civic society free of total regulation on the part of the political power.

This makes possible a new stable centre in a civic society, consisting of various social and class forces, and creates the prerequisites for the transition of the authoritarian power (usually in the hands of military people) into the hands of a civil administration.

In conclusion, I would like to ask the natural question: what, today, is the character of our political regime? In what direction and with what succession must we modify ourselves if we want to set up a free law-governed state?

Until the middle of the 1950s, overall regulation in our country embraced the spiritual, economic and political spheres of people's lives.

After the 20th Party Congress our country entered a new epoch. In economic and political spheres the people are estranged, as before, from property and power, these spheres are totally regulated. But in the spiritual sphere, we see a transition to authoritarianism in our country. After the 20th Congress we say "dual opinion": one for official use, the other—for oneself, one's friends and for one's

people. Classical authoritarianism reigns in this sphere. The regime covertly declares its readiness not to interfere in the internal life and thoughts of the person who does not speak out in public or in the press against it.

Over the last 30 years we have been preparing ourselves spiritually for a transition from authoritarianism to democracy. At that time, an unofficial culture took shape alongside the official and began to develop. This gave a start to the gradual integration and legalization of many values of prerevolutionary culture and the achievements of human spirit in general, which, for some reason or other, were excluded from the censorship lists. At a certain stage, approximately from the mid-1970s, these two currents drew closer together. Banned names, as well as works from the sphere of unofficial culture, began to force their way through to official culture. Cultural workers and scientists formally not admitted into official culture and not shown much kindness by the authorities often enjoyed greater respect and popularity than those who were officially recognized and constantly in sight. As the cultural level of officials in the political hierarchy rose, unofficial culture and its representatives began to be appreciated and backed covertly by "educated apparatchiks". When Mikhail Gorbachev proclaimed the transition from a policy of revolutionary perestroika, the spiritual ground was almost ready.

It is my belief that in the spiritual sphere our country has built a civic society which has become the foothold of the new policy which, unfortunately, does not exist as yet in other spheres. Over the past three years we have practically passed over to guided democracy in the spiritual sphere. Even the sprouts of full democracy with all its attributes have appeared in this sphere. It seems to me that the collection "There Is No Other War", recently published, is about the entry of our country and political regime into the stage of censorless, unregulated development of the spiritual sphere, when each institution and phenomenon in our society may face the critical intellect of a researcher, irrespective of the views and decisions of various powerful state authorities.

I think that our country is now going through a period of transition from totalitarianism to authoritarianism in the economic sphere as well, at least at the level of scientific work-outs and legislative acts. This is the road which we shall probably follow for many decades until public ownership in the form of cooperative associations is granted priority over state ownership, relieving the economic sphere of rigid state tutelage and regulation.

But, to make this process advance successfully in the economic sphere, the authorities must carry out gradual transition to authoritarianism in the political sphere through direct elections, with different candidates nominated from separate organizations as well as from groups of Communists. Reserving for the party the authoritarian powers of the supreme arbiter in the political sphere, it is necessary to pull out of the party's

"womb" the state it has swallowed and recreate normal bodies of state power: legislative, executive and judicial in the district, city, region, republic and country. At the same time, under the party's observation, we must regulate relations between various interests of civic society, allowing any side to speak loudly, without resorting to violence that breeds fear, through political channels, legal institutions.

When the institutions of civic society are recognized and, gaining legal grounds, participate in the civilized settlement of conflicts through consensus, then the one-party authority will no longer be necessary. Society will impose its own problems and take decisions, possible and acceptable for the majority, legally, through the democratic mechanism of public self-administration. But the road to this won't be easy and we are just at its beginning.



**Preacher Proposes Ways To Increase Bible Availability**

18080015 Riga PADOMJU JAUNATNE in Latvian  
14 Dec 88 p 4

[Letter by the Seventh Day Adventists' preacher in Daugavpils Geide and A. Sablovskiy's commentary: "It Is Worth Considering"]

[Text] It is undeniable that we are living in a special time of unexpected changes. A man is learning to understand his real value and place in world history and is also starting to recognize his responsibility for what his life and work have given and are giving to society. I, as a believer, am thrilled (of course, in a positive sense) by the thought that the Bible, this unique Book, would be freely available to every person. This is the Book against which people were unsuccessfully fighting during different times; the Book which could neither be covered with the dust of oblivion nor drowned in the sea of insults. It lives in spite of the fact that many people have never read it and do not read it now, and that for many decades one could not find it on the shelves of our bookstores. We are the losers. Some hundred years ago, one writer expressed a noticeable thought concerning the Bible: "A student can go through all kinds of schools and universities, he can use all his abilities to obtain knowledge but... if he does not obey the laws, which he is dependent upon, he will destroy himself... By neglecting his Bible, he neglects a fortune that is more valuable than anything else." A similar thought we can find in the Bible itself: "And that since a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise..." (2. Tim. 3, 15)

However unpleasant it may be, we must admit now that in many aspects we were acting senselessly, if not to use a harsher word. We should bow our heads with the sense of guilt, remembering the words of the prophet Isaiah "The land shall be utterly emptied and utterly spoiled... The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof, because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance... Therefore hath the curse devoured the earth, and they that dwelled therein are desolate..." (Isaiah 24. 3.5.6.)

You see, how bitter the truth is. The fight against the Bible was not only a fight against the idealistic view on the world, but also a fight against the laws which are eternal, against our own lives, and against the happiness of the coming generations. How good it is that man began to recognize the real situation and his own mistakes. Now the voices that call to come back to the Bible are rising. On 29 August 1988, the idea of teaching the Bible in schools was expressed at the Riga rayon teachers' conference. We have read about such proposals in PADOMJU JAUNATNE. These proposals are welcomed, since the young generation can find in the Bible not only true history and beautiful literary pearls, but the foundation for high morals and a clear conscience.

We can say that we are standing in front of a great, even fateful decision. Namely, either to be with the Bible or without it; either to listen to its advice, or again to ignore it; and either to encourage the opportunity to spread the Bible, or to hinder it.

In order to make the revival of the Bible real, I propose the following:

1. To organize a Bible Fund at the LaSSR Culture Committee and to open an account in the State Bank.
2. Those LaSSR residents who care for the Bible to be in every family should make voluntary donations in order to assist in the successful completion of this task.
3. To open a special bookstore (or to open a department in the existing stores) to make it possible for those who have several Bibles to sell them even today to people who do not have one.
4. In order not to lose time, since whole translations are made from the Hebrew and Greek languages, to publish the Bible using the existing translations to the Latvian language. (In my opinion, the best is the translation made by Ernests Gliks)
5. Due to the possible paper shortage, to use all opportunities to get the Bibles in the Latvian language from the stocks existing abroad.
6. To provide the Russians and the representatives of other ethnic groups living in our republic the same opportunities to obtain the Bible in their own languages.

Maybe, there are other proposals.

Respectfully, *Viktors Geide*,  
Seventh Day Adventists' preacher

Obviously, in the present state of society, the question concerning the availability of the Bible is being raised not only by the religious people. First of all and, in my opinion, mainly it is a question concerning the general cultural level of the society and the ethical and aesthetic ideals of the young people. Therefore, we are waiting for answers to the proposals from the republic's new Culture Committee, the Ministry of Public Education, and people in the book publishing business.

*A. Sablovskis*

**BSSR CP CC Official On Decline of Religious Rituals in Belorussia**

18000512

[Editorial Report] Minsk KOMMUNIST BELORUSSII in Russian in its No 12 December 1988 issue carries on page 59 a 4000-word article titled "On Heightening the Role of the Family in Raising a Well- Developed Person" by S. Pavlov, head of the Belorussian SSR CP

CC Department of Propaganda and Agitation. In his article Pavlov asserts that old religious rituals are giving way to new more "esthetically and emotionally satisfying" rituals. He supports this statement by noting that in the last 20 years christenings in Belorussia have "decreased by more than 2 times, from 35

in 1965 to 16

in 1987". Pavlov also asserts that the number of church weddings have "decreased by three times and are now rarely encountered."

On the other hand, Pavlov also states that not all problems in the religious sphere have been overcome. The activities of religious sects, especially in some of the republic's western rayons, are still widespread. He also

asserts that these sects often exert "extremist forms of influence" on believers and those who are wavering between atheism and professing religious beliefs. He blames Soviet and republic organizations which fail to give their "atheist work an individual, particularly human and spiritual character" for this.

'COPYRIGHT Kommunist Belorussii 1988'

**ERRATUM: Moslem, Russian Orthodox Officials Meet with KaSSR Council of Ministers**

[In JPRS-UPA-88-050 of 10 November 1988, in the article "Moslem, Russian Orthodox Officials Meet with KaSSR Council of Ministers," which is on page 115, in the first paragraph R. Nysanbayev should be referred to as "representative" not "chairman".]

### UkSSR Publishing Chief on Revival of Literary Heritage

18110016a Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA  
in Ukrainian 4 Nov 88 p 2

[Interview with Yu. P. Dyachenko, chairman, Ukrainian SSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, by V. Krasnodemskyy, head of RADYANSKA UKRAYINA culture department: "Discovering Intellectual Islands"]

[Text] Are we well acquainted with our history, our culture, and with those who have rendered service to our people with their tireless labor and self-sacrifice? As recently as a few years ago we were not asking ourselves such questions, at least aloud. We simply accepted that which was officially presented, so to speak, for cultural use. Of course those who had a serious interest in our native culture knew even then that Mykola Khvylyovyy, Valeryan Pidmohylnyy, and Hryhoriy Chuprynka were also a part of our literature.... The names of these writers were even mentioned from time to time in certain scholarly studies and monographs, but with obvious intent of adverse criticism. It was as if they were pushing and nudging our literature in an indirect way.... But publishing their works was out of the question. Is that not the reason why all of us were in a strange situation? We essentially knew nothing about the creative endeavors of a great many persons active in Ukrainian culture (and were things different as regards persons in Ukrainian history?), and we used ideological labels which were so abundantly produced during the years of high-handed cult of personality as well as in more recent times.

Today, when our society is going through a time of spiritual and intellectual purification and rebirth, above all else we want to know the truth. Both in order in some measure to pay our moral debt to persons who over the course of decades were ruthlessly and unjustly deleted from our history and from our memory. But probably this burning truth is needed even more for ourselves—first and foremost for our own spiritual sacrament. And that passionate poetic cry "Discover spiritual islands in the ocean of our people"—which at the beginning of the 1960's rang sonorously from the lips of the young Vasyl Symonenko—is becoming increasingly relevant with each passing year.

How can we more quickly return these spiritual treasures, acquired in the course of the past years of conflict and cruelty, to our people, and how can we eliminate the so-called "blank spots" on the spiritual landmass of our history? This was the subject of an interview by our correspondent with Yu. P. Dyachenko, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade.

[Krasnodemskyy] Finally we seem to have clarified things and reached agreement on whom to publish and how, we have drawn up solid plans and have calculated for an entire decade. As they say, however, not many of

the anticipated books have come out. And if we compare our efforts with what has already been accomplished by our neighbors, such as in the RSFSR, we don't look good at all. Is this not the reason why a prominent critic recently commented that in this noble work, which is so necessary to our contemporaries, "not much is happening yet in the republics. The overwhelming majority of literary events are taking place in Moscow"?

Incidentally, in the past as well we have encountered instances where the works of a given Ukrainian writer were first published in Moscow and subsequently in our republic. It is unfortunate, but this tradition, which was born in the period of stagnation, has not yet been completely eradicated. This year, for example, Mykola Khvylyovyy's novel "Sanatoriyna zona" [Sanatorium Zone], after many years, was first published in Moscow, in Russian translation. In your opinion, Yuriy Pavlovych, what is the primary obstacle here, preventing us from working in the new manner?

[Dyachenko] In my opinion there are several causes. And perhaps we should state first of all that our scholars have proven unprepared for such a complex task. Or, more accurately, not entirely prepared. I shall cite a typical example. The Dnipro Publishing House could have published a one-volume collection of Volodymyr Vynnychenko's prose this year. But the readers will not receive it in a timely manner. What is the problem? It is simply that the preface for this edition is not yet ready, for as we wrote for the most part until quite recently: Aha, this is "white," while this is "black"—it does not suit us. In this case you simply cannot apply this simplified principle of analysis, for the figure of Volodymyr Vynnychenko—both in literature and in societal affairs—is rather ambiguous and contradictory. Scholars studying his works cannot ignore the person of the writer as a citizen. It is essential to make a basic, comprehensive analysis of his literary legacy in order for the reader to gain an objective understanding of this complex individual.

Only now have we grasped that few of our scholars have thoroughly studied the literary process of our republic in the 1920's and 1930's, especially the writings of authors who have long been deleted from our literature by the cruel hand of lawless Stalinist actions.

All this is fact. But there are also other things we cannot ignore. Especially our tiny, poor base of primary source materials. Such materials are entirely lacking for some writers and certain periods. Or, stated more accurately, we have no knowledge of such sources.

Today we can make use of a great deal of existing scholarly research, including the eight-volume "Istoriya ukrayinskoyi literatury" [History of Ukrainian Literature], which literally teems with gaps pertaining to elucidation of the past and which contains outdated appraisals.

[Krasnodemskyy] It is certainly nice to hear about an improving situation, but what of the literary heritage which has been forgotten by or is totally unknown to the general reader has as yet appeared in the bookstores, and what can we expect to see published in the near future?

[Dyachenko] We have begun with our pure sources, with our historical heritage—with preparation to publish a unique, systematized 10-volume edition of early Russian and early Ukrainian chronicles. Incidentally, in past years the idea of such a solid, basic publication was born time and again and... then died for various reasons. This large-format, painstakingly-created edition will include the "Russian" Chronicle (in the 15th-century Hypatian redaction), regional Ukrainian chronicles of the 16th and 17th centuries, the Hustynskyy Chronicle, the "Synopsis," the chronicles of Samovydyts, Hryhoriy Hrabynka, and Samil Velychko, and the "Istoriya Rusiv" [History of Rus].... In short, the Ukrainian reader will finally have the opportunity to become acquainted with our early cultural monuments in quantity. The first volume will be coming out this year. It will be approximately 70 sheets in size and will be printed in an edition of 50,000 copies.

In the last two years this republic's readers have received books by Mykola Kostomarov, Sydor Vorobkevych, Danyl Mordovyts, Valeryan Polishchuk, Oleksandr Konyskyy, Natalya Romanovych-Tkachenko, Sava Bozhko, Hryhoriy Kosynka, Oleksa Vlyzko, Timofiy Bordulyak, Hrytsko Hryhorenko (Oleksandr Sudovshchykov-Kosach), Olena Pchilka, Myroslav Irchan, and others.

The next two years will be much more fruitful. Our list of recommendations and the publishers' schedules still contain the names of approximately 100 writers whose works have not been published for years for one reason or another. In particular, these include works by M. Voronny, B. I. Antonych, V. Hryhorovych-Barskyy, Ye. Pluzhnyk, M. Dray-Khmara, Les Kurbas, P. Kulish, O. Oles (Kandyba), Hanna Barvinok, A. Chaykovskyy, D. Zahul, M. Zerov, P. Karmanskyy, V. Pidmohylnyy, H. Shkurupiy, M. Ivchenko, M. Yalovyy (Yulian Shpola), V. Vrazhlyvyy, and V. Vynnychenko, whom we have already mentioned.

I have another bit of pleasant news for our readers—finally they will have the opportunity to obtain in the bookstores the five-volume "Ukrayinska Literaturna Entsiklopediya" [Ukrainian Literary Encyclopedia], which is about to be published by the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Literature imeni T. H. Shevchenko and the Main Editorial Board of the Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia. The first volume is ready for press and will be published before year's end. This publishing project is being carried out pursuant to a decision by the Presidium of the UkSSR Academy of Sciences and the Collegium of UkSSR Goskomizdat. We believe that it will help bring to light little-known talents in our literature and will stimulate scholarly and civic

thinking. The encyclopedia will comprehensively show the development of Ukrainian literature in an interlinkage with development of the literatures of the brother peoples of the USSR and the world literary process.

[Krasnodemskyy] Two weeks ago, at a meeting of the planning and budget commission of the UkSSR Supreme Soviet, at which proposed allocations for education and culture for this coming year were being considered, some figures were announced which aroused concern on the part of the deputies. According to these figures, in the coming year our republic's readers will receive almost 15 million copies of published books fewer than the figures specified in the five-year plan. There was concern (and not without reason) that this unforeseen "minus" will also have a negative effect on publication of forgotten writers. Is it possible that contemporary writers will yield their own place in publication schedules to their gifted and unwarrantedly forgotten predecessors, who essentially for decades and sometimes even longer have been awaiting their turn, waiting for their time?

[Dyachenko] You know, things are not as simple as it might seem at first glance. Of course we were placing certain hopes on these 15 million copies, for we had been planning to use the additional publishing volume figures to publish books for which our readers have been anxiously waiting and to increase printings of items which are in greater demand.

Of course if this does not happen (but most probably it will), we will simply be unable to increase the size of certain printings and add new titles to publishing schedules. As for contemporary writers whose books are on the publishing schedules and with whom publishing agreements have been signed—we cannot arbitrarily remove them from the schedule.

[Krasnodemskyy] Of course forcible removal is wrong. But the writers themselves, for the sake of their predecessors who were victims of repressive measures, for the sake of the reader and, finally, for the sake of our literature, which was so savagely destroyed by the lackeys of Stalin and Kaganovich, could themselves display good will, such as, for example, was suggested by T. Zhuchkova in KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE [Review of Books]. That is, they could perform a noble act—put off at least for a year the reprinting of their own books for the benefit of increasing printing runs for those works which our readers are presently waiting so impatiently.

[Dyachenko] That is certainly a reasonable and humanitarian idea and does make some sense. I repeat, however, that this is an entirely voluntary matter, and we cannot influence this process by compelling cooperation. In addition, the publishers' lists of titles for the coming year have already been approved, agreements have been signed with the authors, and printing runs have been set.... Thus it is not only a question of ethics but of economics as well. Unpleasant conflict situations could arise, caused by failure to meet contractual obligations.

[Krasnodemskyy] Many names which we are discussing today were returned to our readers following the historic 20th CPSU Congress. Collected writings of Hryhoriy Kosynka, Yevhen Pluzhnyk, and Mykola Zerov were published.... This was certainly a positive phenomenon in our literature. But we encountered other things as well. That which was published at that time was also molded to suit the censor, to meet ideological demands, to fit unsophisticated bureaucratic tastes, and of course fail to give a clear idea of the creative countenance of a given writer. And today it is so important not to proceed once again along that simplified path of stereotype and not to repeat yesterday's mistakes.

[Dyachenko] Those are quite valid complaints. It is true that these publications do not provide a comprehensive and profound picture of their authors. They were specifically prepared, with cuts from the text, and they were readied for publication without proper textual analysis—therefore they fail to meet elementary requirements and patently fail to satisfy today's readers.

[Krasnodemskyy] Therefore publishers are now again returning to these names.

[Dyachenko] What can you do? It is necessary to correct past mistakes. Unquestionably one should not wait and delay in this matter.

I repeat, however: efforts by the publishers alone are inadequate in this matter. Common efforts are needed: by writers, scholars, reviewers, and editorial boards, as well as the public. Toward this end an interministerial scientific coordination council was established a few days ago to deal with preparation and publishing of that cultural heritage which up to the present time has been unknown to the general reader. Members of the council include scholars, writers, and publishers.

[Krasnodemskyy] But we learned from the newspapers back at the end of last year about the decision by the presidium of the Union of Writers of the Ukraine to form such a commission to coordinate activities. And just now it is finally getting into operation. Why has the organizational process dragged on so long?

[Dyachenko] Once again we see symptoms of relapse to the old ailment: narrow parochial interest and scattering of efforts, for there are many ideas, and everybody has now learned to speak in an impassioned manner, but when it comes down to concrete action, there are few willing to get going and get the job done. Perhaps this is what happened in this case as well.

[Krasnodemskyy] It is that chronic ailment where they would decide in the offices of bureaucrats what the people must read and what people can do without, although unfortunately this has affected publication of the writings of many well-known writers who have represented great contribution to our literature. It is paradoxical, but fact nonetheless: certain works even of

our famed classical writers Taras Shevchenko, Ivan Franko, Lesya Ukrayinka, and others in fact were kept from the readers for decades. Is it not high time to renounce this?

[Dyachenko] Without question, and we must rectify the situation although, I shall state quite frankly, it is not as easy to do this as some might think.

Let us take, for example, such a unique publication as the 50 volumes of the works of Ivan Franko, which we have just recently completed. And it turns out (incidentally, this was known prior to this time) that many of Franko's writings are not contained in these volumes, that this edition cannot even make an approximate claim to be a complete collection of this writer's works. But of course it will not be possible in the near future to republish these 50 volumes, with appropriate corrections and additions. That means that we must raise the question of publishing supplemental volumes to this unique set, in order to include all the most valuable items which for various reasons have not been published.

[Krasnodemskyy] Recently, at an evening event in Kiev commemorating another great poetess, Yuriy Shcherbak said with sadness in his voice: "We must beg forgiveness of Lesya Ukrayinka for the fact that not all her works and not all her letters have been published. We must ask her forgiveness for the fact that we are so lazy and indifferent toward her immortal plays: any other people would have considered it an honor to have these plays in its cultural repository."

[Dyachenko] Yes, we must prepare for publication a collection of the complete works of Lesya Ukrayinka and Oleksandr Dovzhenko.... And, incidentally, even our people's favorite book—Shevchenko's "Kobzar" [The Lutist]—has been published in this republic in abridged form. Also the Naukova Dumka academic publishing house is currently preparing a complete collection of Shevchenko's works in 12 volumes.

[Krasnodemskyy] That is, absolutely full and complete?

[Dyachenko] Yes, it will be indeed a complete publication of the Kobzar legacy. In addition, it will be a standard which can be used in republishing individual works of Shevchenko, which can (and should!) be adopted as a standard. With all commentaries and with different versions of a given work. Therefore, as you can understand, it is necessary to perform considerable preparatory scholarly work, without which it is impossible to produce a complete, solid book or study.

[Krasnodemskyy] Without question the main burden in filling in so-called "blank spots" rested on the Dnipro, Radyanskyy Pysmennyk, and Naukova Dumka publishing houses.... And that is the way it should be. But perhaps Veselka and Radyasna Shkola should also be involved. And our republic regional publishing houses Prapor, Mayak, Karpaty, and Kamenyar could also



probably do a great deal, displaying initiative, as they say. I remember that in the mid-1960's a novel by Volodymyr Hzytsky, who had been a victim of repression during the times of cult of personality, entitled "Den i nich" [Day and Night], was published in the journal ZHOVTEN. It dealt with the fate of a person who had gone through the hell of GPU interrogations and later had been sentenced to the northern camps. But since that time this novel has not been published in the Ukraine as a separate book. Would it not be appropriate for the Lvov Kamenyar Publishing House to publish this novel?

[Dyachenko] Of course there is plenty of work for everybody. And each publishing house can (and should!) find its own area of activity in this noble cause. I must say that a great deal is being done in this regard in Uzhgorod and Lvov. Incidentally, the novel "Day and Night" is currently on the publishing schedule of the Kamenyar Publishing House. Prapor could also do a great deal. The fact is that in the 1920's and at the beginning of the 1930's literary life was literally aboil in Kharkov, our republic's capital at that time. Mayak could also do more in this area. In particular, several years ago we recommended that the Odessa publishers put out a collection of the writings of renowned Odessan Isaac Babel. A few days ago I learned that a two-volume collection of Babel's stories is being published next year in Moscow, by the Khudozhestvennaya Literatura Publishing House, while they are still trying to get things going in Odessa.

As you know, the publishing houses are now making up their own list of titles to be published and can independently make various changes in these publishing schedules and determine their scope.... In short, there is no imposition by higher authority, and there are no restrictions. As they say, the ball is now in their court.

We shall be frank: we have waited long enough for the works of many writers who were caught in the harsh millstone of the Stalin cult of personality. We have waited long enough for honest and truthful books which were written in the last century, at the dawn of our country's modern existence, as well as in the recent period which we call the period of stagnation.

Now the ice has begun to break up. But it must melt entirely (the sooner the better) and open up a navigation channel for our cultural heritage.

#### **Activities of New Ukrainian Cultural Society Described**

18000257 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA  
in Russian 5 Oct 88 p 3

[Interview with Aleksandr Semenovich Ivanchenko, president of the Slavutich Society, by correspondent S. Pavlova: "We Ask You Kindly!: Slavutich Gathers Friends"; date and place not specified]

[Text] On 19 May of this year our newspaper, in publishing materials from the round-table discussion entitled "In

Memory of Our Own Principles," reported that the Slavutich Society of Admirers of Ukrainian Culture had been founded in Moscow, and that its membership included not only Ukrainians living in Moscow, but also people of other nationalities: Russians, Belorussians, Poles, Jews—all those who are fond of Ukrainian language and culture.

Today its president, the writer A. Ivanchenko, tells our correspondent about the first few steps which the Slavutich Society has taken.

[Pavlova] Aleksandr Semenovich, although quite a lot of material about your society has already been published in the press, most Muscovites do not yet have a very clear idea about what the Slavutich Society is specifically engaged in doing.

[Ivanchenko] The nature of our society's activity is specified by its name: Admirers of Ukrainian Culture. But the Ukraine has always been multi-national. Let's recall the Zaporozhian Sech, which Karl Marx, in analyzing the structure of its administration, termed the prototype of a republic. And the Sech accepted one and all, without asking questions about their nationality, just so long as they cherished freedom and human brotherhood. Slavutich has gathered together members of various different nationalities, but they are united by one thing: a love for Ukrainian culture. The older generation was basically raised on it. And those who were born in Moscow and grew up, so to speak, remote from this culture, are, nevertheless, still our children and grandchildren. And, in many cases, they have manifested a particular penchant for studying the Ukrainian language.

Assimilating the cultural treasures not only of the Russian but also the Ukrainian people will make our society's members spiritually richer. And herein we see one of our most important tasks.

We also hope that it will be facilitated by the order promulgated by the Moscow Gorispolkom's Main Administration for Public Education, which mandated several rayon administrations to establish inter-school electives for the study of national languages within the capital and based at their own schools; they were also directed to set up such groups within the system of course-type instruction for pupils and working youth, as well as the adult population. Provisions were likewise made for groups in kindergartens, but for some reason only for children of Tatar nationality.

Meanwhile, our thanks even for this. However, for those people who have come up from the Ukraine and would like their children and grandchildren to study their native language (and there are many thousands of them in the capital), the entire complication lies in the fact that they live all over Moscow, and this is an enormous city. Children from the lower grades, not to mention pre-schoolers, would have to be conveyed somewhere and brought back again.

Therefore, in my opinion, for the younger children and the pre-schoolers it would be best to set up exurban summer Pioneer camps and kindergartens using the national language. In that case, there would, first of all, be no problem with staff personnel. Students from our republic's pedagogical VUZ's and colleges would become the Pioneer leaders and guardians (they would also teach the national language). And for the somewhat older children we could set up inter-school electives. But in addition to the national language, the children would also have to study the national history and literature.

We have already founded two schools for the adult population. The first provides lessons in the Ukrainian language; the second—in literature.

Moreover, our historical commission is now compiling a list of monuments and architectural landmarks in Moscow which, in one way or another, are connected with the Ukraine. Of course, the purpose of this is to take part in their restoration or modernization. Standing near Zubovskaya Square, for example, is the very dilapidated house which belonged to the first president of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, Vladimir Ivanovich Vernadskiy. And it is with the restoration of this house, which is dear to us, and not only to us but to the entire country, that Slavutich's youth section has decided to begin its own activity.

[Pavlova] As far as I know, this is not the only sphere of activity to which the society's members will apply their efforts. Am I right?

[Ivanchenko] Yes, we are actively preparing to open up in this capital the Ukrainian Theater of Music and Drama; it used to operate here in Moscow but was closed down during the 1930's upon Stalin's orders. In conjunction with this theater we want to found a folk ensemble of song and dance, as well as a choral group of bandurists [bandura-players]. And, therefore, we need our own music school in order to train personnel for the theater, the ensemble, and the choral group.

Right after the constituent conference of the Slavutich Society, which outlined the basic directions of our activity, the Barev dzes ("Good for You") Moscow Society for Armenian Culture was formed; it is headed up by the renowned motion-picture producer-director B. Baratov. We have already worked out a joint program of festivals of folk songs, dances, and music, and we intend to hold evenings of Ukrainian-Armenian poetry.

At the present time we are already able to conduct Ukrainian-Armenian exhibit-sales of fine and applied arts, as well as items of folk-art handicrafts. Examples of the arts of our two peoples will come to a single house.

Members of the Tatar, Jewish, and Uzbek populations of Moscow have stated their desires to establish their own cultural societies. I think that this is splendid. The very

fact that national cultural societies exist in the capital will pull the rug out from under those idiots [?] who are taking advantage of glasnost to incite blind, nationalistic passions.

Unfortunately, there are no waves without foam. Some persons are not happy with the goals and directions of our work. Taking advantage of a certain delay in the juridical formulation of the status of national-cultural societies in the Moscow Gorispolkom, a certain group of persons, for example, has been speaking out in the name of Slavutich, passing themselves off as members of its council and provoking Moscow's Ukrainians, and especially students, to hold unlawful assemblages. Therefore, we must assert that these persons have nothing in common with the true admirers of Ukrainian culture.

[Pavlova] Are Slavutich's activities being assisted by the Ukrainian Permanent Representation in Moscow?

The Permanent Representation has had no reaction at all. In the first place, M. Pichuzhkin, the permanent representative, does not even know the Ukrainian language. In the second place, for him the permanent representation is a "regime-type institution," into which not even a mosquito can fly without a special pass or certificate. It is entirely closed for Moscow's Ukrainians.

The Slavutich Society is supported by every creative union and public organization without exception in our republic. Even Filaret, the patriarchal exarch of all the Ukraine, as well as the metropolitan of Kiev and Galicia, has offered us his unselfish help. But we are not needed by the head of the Ukrainian "regime institution."

And we would like to have some help, even if only in a matter which is so urgent for us—that of the Ukrainian Bookstore at 9 Arbat Street. It is widely known to many people. Therefore, in taking its decision on 2 February of last year concerning the second stage of the Arbat's modernization, the Moscow Gorispolkom did not just by chance decide to leave this store at its old site. But the permanent representation, for whom, it would seem, an interest in Ukrainian literature should be dear, was decidedly opposed to this. The building is old, they say, and decrepit; it would be cheaper to build a new one. And, having in front of their eyes the example of the Meiuri Georgian Cultural-Trade Center, the representation began to agitate for granting a site for just such a Ukrainian center on Stankevich Street, very close to the permanent representation, where there is a free space measuring 30 by 15 meters. We are in favor of such a center. It's needed. But it's also understandable that it would not be a good idea to "squeeze" the store into such a small space. Z. Kharitonova, chief of the sector for the comprehensive modernization of the urban environment under the Scientific-Research and Planning Institute for Moscow's General Plan, has become a powerful ally of the permanent representation. She had read somewhere that located in the basement under the present-day area occupied by the Ukrainian Bookstore there was a little

restaurant known as the "Arbat Wineshop" back during the 1920's, and that it was sometimes visited, supposedly, by V. Mayakovskiy, S. Yesenin, and B. Pasternak. It's possible that it happened that way, but does that make it equitable to close down Moscow's only Ukrainian Bookstore in order to open a wineshop on this site and, furthermore, to allot it 1,870 square meters?

[Pavlova] Do you consider that the entire building should remain in the hands of the Ukrainian Bookstore?

[Ivanchenko] What I have in mind is only that part of the house which Z. Kharitonova is planning to convert to a restaurant. Not only would all the Ukrainians in this capital be grateful for a decision by the Moscow Gorispolkom to leave the bookstore there, but Moscow too would save a considerable sum by this action. As we have been assured by A. Klimenko, the deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Goskomizdat, they are prepared to allocate the necessary funds on any conditions to renovate the house under the Ukrainian Bookstore. And B. Polui, chief of Mosproyekt-2 Workshop 8, in that case, has given his firm promise to perform all the planning operations in the shortest possible time. The Ukrainian Writers' Union and the Slavutich Society would also take part in such a modernization.

[Pavlova] Aleksandr Semenovich, upon the decision of UNESCO, the coming year has been proclaimed Shevchenko Year. How does the Slavutich Society intend to mark the upcoming jubilee of the great Kobzar [Kobzar-Player]?

[Ivanchenko] The press has already reported on our expedition to the Aral Sea area, where T.G. Shevchenko spent 10 years in punitive exile, wrote almost half of "Kobzar," and made more than 400 drawings. There in Aralsk, in March of next year the Ukrainian artists and writers' unions, along with the Slavutich Society, are preparing to set up a monument to the poet-revolutionary and to lay out around it a 40-hectare memorial park, which, as we hope, will constitute the beginning of forest plantings around the entire Aral Sea. Here we are being actively assisted by the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, the OKB [Experimental Design Bureau] imeni O.K. Antonov, especially by A. Bulanenko, the deputy general designer, and, of course, by the USSR and Ukrainian SSR academies of sciences.

We likewise have plans for conducting the jubilee in Moscow. As you know, the year 1964 witnessed the opening of the Library imeni T.G. Shevchenko at 6 General Yermolov Street. Upon the decision of the Moscow Gorispolkom, it was envisioned as a center for propagating Ukrainian literature. But this decision, like many others, was forgotten, although nobody ever abrogated it. Since that time the library, which was ceremoniously opened by Andrei Pavlovich Shevchenko, the great grand-nephew of the great Kobzar, has led a wretched existence, being essentially neither Ukrainian nor Russian. Therefore, by the time of the forthcoming

T.G. Shevchenko Jubilee, the Slavutich Society wanted to finally implement that long-ago decision by the Moscow Gorispolkom, i.e., to make the library Ukrainian. With this goal in mind, we directed an appeal to V. Vrublevskaya, the Ukrainian SSR deputy minister of culture. And immediately we received the "O.K." But meanwhile, as it turned out, the Kiev Rayispolkom had abrogated the Moscow Gorispolkom's decision by its own decision and converted the sole cultural institution in Moscow linked with the name of T.G. Shevchenko into some kind of commercial enterprise.

In the opinion of A. Shchukin, the deputy chairman of the Kiev Rayispolkom, what was done was not exactly good, but what was "remarkable was this new form of working with the population." Perhaps so, but what does this have to do with the sacred name of T.G. Shevchenko? The Ukrainian Writers' Union, the Council on Ukrainian Literature of the USSR Writers' Union, the Slavutich Society, and the editors of the journal DRUZHBА NARODOV have sent a telegram to V. Trusov, the chairman of the Kiev Rayispolkom; it contains a decisive protest against converting the Ukrainian library named after the great Kobzar into a commercial enterprise.

We hope that the leading officials of the Kiev Rayispolkom will mark the Shevchenko Jubilee by rescinding this strange decision.

#### **RSFSR Writers Union Plenum Attacks OGONEK, Leading Reform Figures**

##### **Zaslavskaya, Aganbegyan Assailed**

*18000440a Moscow LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA  
in Russian No 51, 23 Dec 88 pp 2-5*

[Unattributed report: "Perestroyka and Commentary. The RSFSR Writers Union Board Plenum"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] The floor was given to A. Salutskiy for his report.

[Passage omitted]

The opinion is widespread in writers' circles that some publications are categorizing authors as their own people and others' according to some kind of criteria alien to literature. Here, it is being said, we have a visible embodiment of cliquishness. However, analysis does not confirm this. It seems to me in general that cliquishness as an internecine and unprincipled struggle for leadership in literature is outdated. In our crucial and decisive times it is a question of a fundamental delineation of viewpoints on certain important issues of public, spiritual and economic life. And today the road to consolidation lies not through calling a halt to polemic or applying some kind of universal lubricant but on the contrary only through democratic dialogue on the basis of equality.



Appeals for this are being heard at the highest level. The atmosphere in the creative milieu, however, remains complex. The situation in commentary is helping in an understanding of some of the reasons for the general malaise.

Let us take as an example the sphere of economic commentary.

At the 27th CPSU Congress and in Orel, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said that in the past money-exchange relations were underestimated. This has been checked—the word was used twice: underestimation. Some of our economics journalists have set to work to absolutize money-exchange relations. That is their right. Psychologically it is possible to understand people who are weary of the long silence. But how has the press behaved? From former prohibition it has rushed to the other extreme and one no longer finds reflections about the limits to which the market can be applied under socialism or its combination with the plan.

The fashion is now for “the commodity people.”

And the diktat has become absolute, and moved on to political assessments. If you favor perestroika you read Lisichkin; such is the demand of the tireless Tatyana Ivanovna in OGONEK. If you do not read Lisichkin then you are indifferent to perestroika.

What talk can there be of dialogue if this kind of approach is taken?

To the point, using this same scheme the advocates and opponents of perestroika have artificially divided our society with regard to attitudes toward “Children of the Arbat.” Anyone who does not applaud the novel is accused of being a defender of personality cult. Meanwhile, I am deeply convinced that “Children of the Arbat” has improved the appearance of and softened the terrible face of personality cult, and Lanshchikov has shown this brilliantly in his article “We All Look at the Napoleons” published in NASH SOVREMENNİK.

Let me return to the situation in commentary. Shmelev's economic model has been ceremonially hoisted to the apex of public attention and no one has been allowed to doubt any of its postulates. Even during the period of stagnation such a surfeit of praise was unheard of. Did we at that time dare to declare someone most-read author of the year? And now it is all nothing!

It is strange that, finding a successful rubric for comparing two opinions, even LITERATURNAYA GAZETA did not dare discuss “Advances and Debts.” Only the journals MOSKVA and NASH SOVREMENNİK entered into polemic. But the press, which has glorified Shmelev, maintains a silence of the grave. The broad public knows of no alternative viewpoint.

Shmelev has the right to express his own opinion. But his proposals threaten to stratify society and deform our morals; thanks to open advertising they have become so enrooted in the mass consciousness that it would be a profound error to abandon them without a businesslike discussion.

Now, however, it is more important to explain the role of the so-called leftist press. Is it capable of healthy debate? Or, on the contrary, is it preventing any comparison of views, acting as apologist for a single viewpoint on the development of the economy? Where are we moving, notwithstanding—to pluralism or to spiritual monopoly? The answer to this question is given, in particular, by LITERATURNOYE OBOZRENIYE, which during the years of stagnation conducted an interesting discussion among journalists. Today this journal has assumed a sharply one-sided stance, which is at variance with its name and the spirit of the times.

Here, of course, it is essential to draw a distinction with the literary monthlies. For these, polemic is a tradition of the Russian public life, and the disputes of the Slavophiles and Westernizers have enriched Russian philosophical thought. And it is a fine thing that we have NOVYY MIR and ZNAMYA, NASH SOVREMENNİK, MOSKVA and the other journals with “faces with an unusual expression.” This is a cause not of grief but of joy.

To the point, the stormy literary debates of the last century were not distinguished by any special tact. However, there were never any unworthy appeals to the public to ignore opponents and not read them. But today alas! OGONEK advises us not to read NASH SOVREMENNİK: there is no need, it says, to fill our heads with rubbish. That was what was written! And so one thinks about it: what is this—a method for shaping public opinion or an attempt to manipulate it?

How can one equate the extremely tendentious OGONEK rubric “What To Read” with pluralism? Is it ethical to take advantage of a journal's popularity and the fact that it is published every week to foist on its subscribers a range of reading and incidentally try to compromise its opponents? This is incompatible with glasnost and a direct encroachment on the spiritual sovereignty of the reader and usurpation of the mass media for the purpose of the struggle against those who think differently. And is this democracy? Given this logic what is needed is an alternative to OGONEK that reflects other literary-social views: only then shall we be able really to talk about creative rivalry.

A few words about the atmosphere in the literary structures. The Moscow council on commentary is evidently not discussing in a principled manner the essays of the journals MOSKVA and NASH SOVREMENNİK even

though this has been raised more than once in the party committee and at meetings of the Moscow writers. It is high time for the Moscow secretariat to intervene and organize a dialogue.

Today it is much simpler to set up a telephone connection between the USSR and the United States than it is to organize a discussion in the Writers Union. The facts show that those literary circles that have access to the main sources of glasnost are trying to monopolize their viewpoint and prevent dialogue.

While this is the case no appeals will improve the atmosphere. We must, we are simply obligated to listen to everyone. Attempts to silence or ridicule opponents without giving them any adequate opportunity to set forth their own position serve merely to increase tension. Contrariwise, equal dialogue between all literary-social trends will help in understanding better the far from simple problems of perestroika. Now is not the time to nourish ambition and pin labels on political opponents; it is the time to resolve the fate of the country!

Russia provides an example here, too. The Chelyabinsk writers' organization is putting out a cost-accounting newspaper and there is a new editorial board for each issue. This enables all writers to express their opinions on an equal basis.

The experience of the Baltic and Transcaucasus shows the role that can be played in the whipping up of passions and in creating an ideological uproar that drowns out the healthy voices by a press that assumes a one-sided position. Is it not better to think about the most favorable conditions for an equal dialogue between all literary-social trends than to bring into currency the frontline term "firing line," as Neverov did, without explaining the reason for the tension?

Now permit me to name journalists whose names are well known: Antonov, Valishev, Latsis, Lisichkin, Nuykin, Popov, Prokhanov, Selyunin, Strelyanny, Shmelev. It is possible to single out their concepts but it is clear that each of them has his own convictions and is a strong and independent thinker. Their articles have become a noticeable phenomenon in public life. And I put them at the top of the list not only because the creativity of almost all of them has been rightly assessed in criticism. They have no need of compliments.

Your attention has obviously been drawn to the word "almost." It applies to Mikhail Antonov, who has been unfairly treated by the public attention. The most difficult of men to embark on the path of commentary at his late age, and a true devotee of perestroika, he has courageously engaged in polemic with the recognized authorities, forcing them to stop in their headlong rush to market spontaneity and think about the moral aspect of life. Antonov, who is now being read throughout Russia, is not even a member of the Writers Union. In

our presumptuous self-importance we have forgotten that sometimes it is necessary not to accept but to invite writers to join the union. Antonov is precisely such a case.

Vasiliy Selyunin is also not a member of the union. It would also be proper to invite this original and alas! also not young journalist, to join the union.

A good word should be said about one journalist who has fought tirelessly for simple people but has been passed over by criticism, namely, Anatoliy Rubinov. If it had not been for his sharp articles, prices for services would have been even higher and we would be paying 10 kopecks for the metro, and the weakness of our kind—conversations on the telephone—would have fallen victim to the departmental profits of the communications people.

But the following question arises: what is literary criticism for if it bypasses the journalists of the regional journals and fails to notice the diversity of opinion? The fact is that today serious critics are not dealing with commentary. Even the Surov people have halted the rapid movement of this genre and its previous baggage has suddenly become useless, and it is evidently incapable of understanding the new problems.

But nature abhors a vacuum. And the place of the professional critics has been taken by the masters of the fast reaction from the periphery of the literary world who are jumping on the bandwagon. They are not members of the Writers Union but the main thing is that they do not have an independent view on the development of social processes but merely zealously praise their idols. This is not a disinterested thing, however: you see, they help them to squeeze out the articles, and then perhaps the little books. Some of them have much erudition and ambition, but little ammunition.

In order to give you an idea of their style let me quote to you from a review in which the author writes not about the essence of the issue but about the merits of the journalist: "He makes hay, drives a combine harvester. He knows how to cook. He can drive a car, a trifle for him. He knows about medicine and technology. He speaks good English. He has gobbled up mountains of literature on economics, history, Marxist and pre-Marxist philosophy, religion. The journalist is a strong and clear thinker."

What a tone for a review! And we decry the complimentary criticism of the period of stagnation. It never reached such a pitch of self-oblivious deluxe self-serving!

I would also like to mention a delicate detail: the reviewer is acquainted with the master cook that is his hero—he was not merely writing about, he had probably tasted it... And this is no joke. Those skilled in the quick response, who feed on literature, in all the meanings of the word, and who could indeed be called apprentices

alas! are a sign of the times. They are not safe because through their unconstrained and tendentious enthusiasm they are poisoning the atmosphere in the literary milieu. In order to rid ourselves of their services it is high time for serious critics to take up the genre of commentary. Let there be disputes; this is the creative way—through the heart and the mind, not through the stomach.

There is no need to speak of the exceptional importance of commentary devoted to the subject of history. Karyakin, Klyamkin, Kozhinov, Kuzmin, Kunyayev, Lanchikov, Latsis and others are working actively here. But in commentary dealing with history the same distortions have occurred as in economics.

When we started to bring back from the shadow of the tragic events the names of those consigned to oblivion, the authors of some published pieces started to idealize certain political figures of the past, particularly Bukharin. But is it really possible to think about that time if a special gloss is imparted to the biography? In this connection it is useful to quote some lines from the report of Metropolitan Krutitskiy and Kolomenskiy Yuvenaliy at the celebrations on the occasion of the millennium of the Russian church. "They ask why the list of those canonized does not contain the new Russian martyrs," Yuvenaliy said, having in mind the clergy repressed after the revolution. And he continued: "I would like to answer that. The local synod had no intention transforming the sacred issue of canonization into political emotions. A responsible and prudent approach to consideration of our contemporary history has been reflected in present-day canonization in the Russian church."

It is no sin to accept this wisdom: should we canonize rehabilitated political figures of the past? Would it not be more useful to study their destiny, with all its contradictions, so as to develop in general an accurate view of history?

And there is one more fundamental question. We have become so accustomed to honoring the important figures that for many the only interesting things in history are the important figures. And some journalists, and even press organs, leave aside the tragedy of the people. Is this right?

As it becomes immersed in the depths of Soviet history, commentary has isolated itself from the events of the period of stagnation. But study of those events is now of vital importance. Again, what I have in mind is not a narrow interest in the fate of Brezhnev and his son-in-law and grandchildren, but ordeals that fell to the lot of the people.

Everyone knows how much misfortune was brought to our countryside by the resettlement of the "unpromising" villages. No one, on the left or the right, would fail to condemn this campaign or to understand that it would undermine the vital forces of the countryside, and its tragic consequences are with us to this very day.

But why, importunately and not entirely selflessly swarming about in the literary peripeteia of the period of stagnation, did we not ask a question incomparably more important for the fate of perestroika: who was the author of the inglorious campaign to resettle the "unpromising" villages? For there are no anonymous acts in history.

In the late 1960's the author of one article asked a shattering question: why in general do we need the villages at all? And this is the answer that was given: the essential function of the countryside is "that the rural population insures the most efficient exploitation of resources dispersed across a territory." This is what it was all about. The person is not the end but the means. An old song: people are material for the building of socialism.

And without subtlety the author went on to write as follows:

"A quite dispersed network of small rural settlements has taken shape for historical reasons. Most of these settlements do not meet present-day requirements or the sociocultural services required by the population, and accordingly, according to the scheme for regional planning, of the 705,000 rural settlements in the country only 120,000 should be further developed."

Today it is strange to hear these inhuman plans to reduce to one-sixth the number of villages. And we know what their purpose was. And it was irresistible to provide scientific substantiation for them. This is what they wrote:

"The economic calculations show that in order to insure an equal level of services in small villages we would need 5 to 8 times more physicians, 2 to 3 times more teachers..."

(A voice from the hall): Who?

A. Salutskiy: I shall name a name, of course, I shall give a name.

But what bureaucrat would not leap at this tempting opportunity to reduce the number of bedbugs. And they did, from the lowest to the highest! And science continued to press:

"What is needed is active and purposeful work to resettle the small and smallest settlements... The task is to find optimal forms and methods for the resettlement of small settlements and impart to this process a planned and organized nature."

It is common knowledge that the forms and methods were quickly found: schools and medical facilities and stores were closed and they worked with a will to drive out the peasants from their ancestral nests. More could be cited, but what has been said is enough to understand the fateful role played by these scientific developments

proposed to the government. In NOVYY MIR Belov recently complained bitterly about them and noted that "it is difficult to decide who the father of this was." So, Vasiliy Ivanovich, who the father was is indeed unknown, but we can name the mother.

All the above quotes were taken from the works of Academician Zaslavskaya!

This theory does also have a godfather—the former director of the Academy of Sciences Siberian Branch Institute of Economics and Organization of Production, within whose walls Zaslavskaya worked on her draft for the destruction of the villages—Academician Aganbegyan.

Now we see clearly the reasons for the major scientific error that Zaslavskaya made in recommending the resettlement of the unpromising villages. It was a great untruth of abstract scientific calculation. Ignoring the realities of life, unconcerned for the study of historical and cultural roots of the peasantry and the psychology of the people, idealizing management practice and placing its trust in purely mathematical logic, economics plunged our countryside into a zone of new suffering.

And here the question of repentance is sharply raised. No, not because of the outburst of emotion or the ritual of self-cleansing. Today academicians Aganbegyan and Zaslavskaya are leading experts in economics, and in the West they are even hailed as the architects of perestroika. And society has the right to be assured that these scholars, whose recommendations are so highly regarded, have recognized the very serious error committed 20 years ago.

Until society is convinced of this there can be no firm conviction that the present project of these scholars will not repeat earlier gross errors.

Where is the guarantee that the catastrophic 100-billion budget of 1989 that the journal KOMMUNIST reported does not contain in part a trace of the fundamental miscalculations permitted by those scholars in working on the present economic model?

Academician Zaslavskaya is herself a most active proponent of retail price increases. But do her proposals not smack of the same alienation from the life of the people and the same speculativeness of the abstract mathematical models that led to the fateful resettlement of the countryside? Will the price increases not strike a political blow against perestroika?

The economics journalists supporting Zaslavskaya are demanding that the market first of all be saturated with goods. But they link this only to reduced demand. Others write candidly that our people, so they say, are eating too much fat, are well dressed, and stand in line to buy ladies' boots at R120 a pair. And now, raise the prices so as to get rid of the lines and saturate the market! "Let

those who want to and can flourish!": such is the motto of the advocates of the nouveaux riches, who are unconcerned about the growing material inequality in the country.

Zalygin demands a public report on projects that are transforming nature. But why do socioeconomic projects not also require such inspection? However, a pro forma sort of debate is taking place. But what is happening is that the newspapers are engaged in a rivalry to print the articles by Academician Zhavoronkov about the Baykal, and Rasputin is not published.

Through the multitude of smart interviews in the journals the public interest has been focused only on the ideas of Aganbegyan and Zaslavskaya. It is a well-planned campaign. Why are the voices calling for deeper analysis of these ideas being silenced? Why is it that a large part of the public does not know that Zaslavskaya is the author of the concept of resettlement of unpromising villages?

The lessons of the long-suffering history of Soviet science should not be forgotten. Even real scholars have not always succeeded in avoiding the temptation of introducing their own ideas by means of eliminating their opponents. For big science, fierce competition for the influence of politicians and a struggle to gain the goodwill of the top authorities are in general typical. In addition, there are scientists who are prepared to jump on the bandwagon for whatever is in favor or even really mistaken. For example, in the seventies Lisichkin passionately defended Bodyul's giant orchards, which caused Moldavia such terrible misfortune. And now he is counseling just as ardently in favor of the smallest agrarian forms.

In real economics there are many secondary factors. Neglect of those factors by official science leads to social ills. And here the view of the writer researching deep into life and the fine web of informal relations is not unimportant.

A question not devoid of interest was posed in NASH SOVREMENNİK by Boris Kulikov: "Comrades Zaslavskaya and Aganbegyan did not become academicians today. I would very much like to know about the outstanding economic discoveries and their practical introduction that brought such high degrees and titles to these bold people." I think that I have at least in part answered that question.

The essay by Aleksandr Tsukanov "Why Did They Win?" (the journal VOLGA) adds to what I say. It is the question of the Volga-Don canal: when it goes into operation and starts sucking water out of the Volga, the northern rivers will have to be diverted south. Such is the crafty thinking of the diverters. Now I quote: "In the fall of 1986 specialists from various scientific research institutes gathered in Volgograd. They were hoping that those

participating in the Caspian expedition led by Academician Aganbegyan would reflect the true state of affairs when preparing recommendations for the Council of Ministers. But the members of the expedition with expressions of boredom on their faces arrived on 'Ikaruses' at the canal construction site for half an hour. Someone asked: 'Where will the tourists go next?' Everything was just like a trip by a group of tourists. And today construction of the Volga-Don canal has been confirmed by the Council of Ministers."

The public is sounding the alarm about the rapid canal construction. Taking this into account, the Council of Ministers is setting up a special expedition led by an eminent academician... But is the Council of Ministers aware of the details of the work of the expedition that the journal VOLGA reported? Is it possible to go like a tourist to study the problems of diverting the waters—problems that are of vital importance for the country?

It should be noted that journalists sharing the views of Aganbegyan and Zaslavskaya are most indifferent to the ecology. Of course, there is no point in demanding that everyone must pay attention to it. But the trouble is that their conception sometimes directly contradicts the aims of nature conservation.

Shmelev has formulated his credo: "Everything that is economically inefficient is immoral, and contrariwise, what is efficient is moral." So it turns out that chemical combines, which produce profitable output but poison people, are moral? This is doubtful... Forgetting about social and ecological priorities was a feature of anti-human Stalinist policy. And suddenly—again we have the idolization of efficiency... In Shmelev's formula it is not difficult hear echoes of the theory of Zaslavskaya, who turned the peasant into a "rural population insuring efficient exploitation of resources..."

However... Does it not remind us of the sly words of Vasilii Shukshin, who wrote: "And ultimately, do we not follow the fops?"

Comrades, the concern and alarm about commentary is universal. The time for illusions and economic romanticism is past and we must recognize that it is not simple to deal with this present historical crossing. It is therefore the sacred duty of commentary not only to pay attention to the evils of the day. It is designed and obliged to look ahead.

In the success of a revolution the combination of destructive and creative tasks acquires great importance. For us, destruction is the struggle against the command-power way of thinking, the legacy of Stalin. And creativity is affirmation of a democratic, economically strong socialist society. In this, the main issue of perestroika, we are one. Attempts to divide writers into so-called advocates and opponents of perestroika are simply

immature. Differences occur only in the search for ways to renew society, but these are healthy disagreements and they should settle down through dialogue, in a democratic way.

But, I repeat, things stand poorly with dialogue. It is predominantly only one way for switching to a new state of society, borrowed largely from the West, imported, that is being introduced into the mass consciousness via the press. And the advocates of this path explain the economic failures exclusively by intrigues by braking forces. But I think it would be much more useful to conduct a careful analysis of the actual reality, and to look ahead.

Has not the mechanism of the cooperatives been deformed, and are there not too many cooperatives—the result of speculative profit? Despite the kinds of state wealth and public wealth, has not the principle "what is not forbidden is permitted" been perverted? Is the call "get rich if you want to and can!" something that is for the burgeoning of everyone, or just the chosen few? If, to use Dostoyevskiy's words, the most important civic virtue is becoming for us the possession of money, then will not honesty and decency and love and friendship be scorned as vices? How will the confrontation between the two new realities—freedom of morals and freedom of conscience—take shape? By setting our hopes on the independence of plants that have got the taste for profit at any price, will the country not tomorrow remain without inexpensive medicines and goods because of the group interests that in the future will replace departmental interests? Will not the leasing business become like a campaign for corn, pulling asunder the strong kolkhozes and bringing confusion to the form of ownership and the method of labor? Will we not undermine our mighty power by eroding the monopoly of foreign trade and dispersing currency resources? In offering alternative choices to managers shall we not frequently move to anarchy and dictatorship on the practical plane?

In general, while we gild the dome shall we not be creating beneath it the alien architecture of some ugly foreign Kalinin Prospect?

So let us look ahead and foresee where life is taking us.

S. Vikulov presented his report.

And so—perestroika!

By most of the people—and this can be said with confidence—it has been perceived as an element of bitterness, and even more—as malice against the architects who laid the foundation of the edifice whose name is socialism, and is present in their souls.



But at the same time in their hearts there is a sense of satisfaction that the party has had the courage for this perestroika and is conducting it on such a scale and with such openness that the world is literally being rocked as it watches us.

"The simple Soviet person"—an expression of those years—is today literally becoming engrossed to the point of paroxysms of sincerity and insomnia by books and articles about the crimes of those who not so long ago, according to these same stories, were idolized or at least regarded as "true Leninists." Yes, and even abroad they are reading us, reading with haste, reading with puzzlement, not believing their eyes. And this is not surprising! History knows of no similar example of self-flagellation as we have shown the world in these past years. What is it for, this unmasking?; this is what our friends and enemies alike are asking.

Nor is this question a trivial one for us, and it cannot be answered unambiguously. For the mature citizens of the country, for all its sons, for ardent patriots for whom the honor of the motherland stands above everything, it is the imperative of the times, an historical necessity for which there is no alternative.

Real patriots dreamed of this even in the stifling atmosphere of Brezhnevism, and this is why the party course toward revolutionary perestroika has been perceived with joy and enthusiasm as it directs all the energy of the emancipated soul toward consideration of what must first be done and how it should be done.

The simple Soviet person, who in the atmosphere of Stalin's and Brezhnev's democracy became accustomed to the role of the little man, the small cog, has believed in glasnost and democracy—and this has been the first result of perestroika!—and has suddenly found his voice and begun to speak openly about the laxity toward drunks, about the pilferers, about the illegal allocation of apartments, in short, about the abuses of their own leaders of their power. And what have they heard in response? Thank you, well done, good man, they say, we have restructured things, we are studying things, we shall correct them? Nothing of the kind! Their answer has been the sidelong glances not only of the authorities but even those who have not disdained the "cake" he has offered with his own hands.

Journalists were the first to look at this "sore" on perestroika, and speaking in the language of literature criticism typical of those who initiated the perestroika conflicts they wrote hundreds of articles for the pages of the newspapers covering a multitude of subjects. Writers are first and foremost social and political observers and they have not been slow in moving into the line of fire and have felt that they were "mobilized and had a mission." Loudly and convincingly, not drowned in the roar of perestroika, the voices of Ivan Vasilyev, Yuri Chernichenko and Vladimir Sitnikov have sounded out: Valentin Rasputin, Vladimir Soloukhin, Vasily Belov,

Boris Mozhayev, Vladimir Kuropatov (from Kemerovo), Boris Kulikov (from Rostov-on-Don), Yevgeniy Karpov (from Stavropol) Stanislav Kunyayev and Aleksey Ochkin (from Moscow) have laid aside their unfinished prose and taken up social and political commentary.

Inspired by their example, the weapon of glasnost has been taken up by their younger comrades: Mikhail Antonov (Moscow), Anatoliy Salutskiy (Moscow), Boris Lapchenko (Kalinin Oblast).

With few exceptions they all write for NASH SOVREMENNİK. It is to them, and also to Kozhinov and Lanshchikov, that all those who are making and want to make perestroika and do not twist their mouths into a crooked smirk, looking at what is happening on the side, have expressed their profound gratitude.

It seems to me that there are also such people among writers. And perhaps because we also do not have any notable artistic works to our credit about the events, and sometimes real dramas whose basis is the eternal struggle between good and evil...

A few words about patriotism—one of the integral parts of the human factor.

Remember 1941, when the black wave of invasion rolled toward Moscow and (I am using the memories of those who took part in the war) words unexpected for the times struck into our souls: "In these battles let the banner of Dmitriy Donskoy, Aleksandr Nevskiy, Aleksandr Suvorov and Mikhail Kutuzov unfurl above you" (I am quoting from memory).

It is not important who said those words. What is important is that they had to be said. For us, the soldiers, they were the benediction of Mother Russia herself. And it was heard, not with the ears but with the heart. And it made the heart beat with even greater alarm, but then with more confidence, with greater calm...

It is impossible to structure (and also restructure!) only by burning things down, only by declaring the past anathema; in other words, it is impossible to move ahead while looking behind and only behind.

I agree that there is reason to glance behind and there is reason to be indignant and to be angry, but you cannot fill your belly just with evil. The land must still be planted... I want to remind of this in particular those who think that it, our land, will plow itself and sow itself and that the rivers of milk will flow without drying up...

For more than half a century the muzhik has been fleeced and his peasant soul trampled, and now we want him to restructure himself without delay and in 2 or 3 years fill our stores with bread, meat and milk.



In issue No 11, 1988 of the journal NEVA Daniil Granin expressed this desire very frankly:

"The main charge against perestroyka is 'plenty of talk but no results.'" Agreeing with this charge, he added: "What results? The simplest and most urgent of them are just everyday results. There used to be lines and there still are. Lines for basic products, not fancy food items. For housing. People are tired... they wait, they have grown tired of promises, of schedules. The stores are empty, there is nothing at the market... We have reached a dangerous boundary of new disillusionment, and this time in the actual and practical implementation of the idea of perestroyka."

Not, it is not these dismal, I would say, mournful speeches that will lend wings to a man.

Here, there is not even a whiff of patriotism.

When I read things like this I cannot believe in the sincerity of the words uttered by the author a little further on: "When they ask me why I believe in perestroyka I say that it is not because we have no alternative. Who knows, perhaps there is an alternative somewhere..." This is what draws the attention: "Why do I believe?" The context of the phrase is such that willy-nilly one reads something else: why do you believe when no one else does? Yes, and what is said about the alternative to perestroyka is definite enough: "Who knows, perhaps there is an alternative somewhere..."

Well, if there is perhaps an alternative somewhere, should we not look for it since "people are tired of waiting"?

Note that again they are tired of waiting, not of working.

I am convinced that this kind of commentary does not help perestroyka. It does not provide inspiration for a person to work, and so I believe that the successful culmination of this unprecedented affair will falter. With confused feelings he reaches out to other journals, but there—my God!—don't gasp!—we read about the camps and the torture and the shootings...

In YUNOST Ginzburg, Mandelshtam and Antonov-Ovseyenko write about this, in ZNAMYA Larin, in OKTYABR Volkogonov, in NOVYY MIR Shalamov. And these are just the recent issues...

I am not against this kind of material. We must talk about the victims of Stalinism and the genocide that he and his companions-in-arms perpetrated against their own people (what shame: socialism and genocide!); who will dispute this! But one involuntarily falls to thinking here: millions were shot and tortured, and each of them had his own fate, his own tragedy that someone wants to relate. And it is not surprising that new manuscripts about this black and tarnished time in our history are constantly arriving on the desks of the journal editors.

We have enough to last for many, many years of these testimonies from the living and the dead that turn the soul upside down. Can the soul bear this, will it not burst from overload? Will not people, particularly young people, turn away in loathing from our ideals and from what we hold sacred?

And most of all, are we not seeing hidden in these pages reeking with blood and oozing horror another danger—an evil with many faces—that same mafia, for example, whose existence (not in the past but now) was twice spoken of from the highest tribune—the tribune of the 19th All-Union Party Conference; or that same Russophobia expressed in the concentration of fire on the Russian people as the main bulwark of the multinational state, and moreover, in a crossfire, because the shots are coming both from the rear and the front...

The reprint by Balkanov of the anonymous letter (fortunately the country still found out who the author was) that had as its task of tasks provoking hatred for the Russian people, and that same Balkanov's accusation of A.G. Kuzmin, member of the NASH SOVREMENNİK editorial board, for having propagandized fascism (see KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA) on the basis of false information from Liberman published in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA; and the article in OGONEK by N. Ilina "A Ghost Come Back To Haunt Us," in which the entire editorial board of NASH SOVREMENNİK was suspected of inheriting the tasks and aims that the "Russian Fascist Party" made up of White Guard emigre rabble set for itself in Kharbin during the war years, and which the emigre Ilina knew quite well. The Eydelman interview in OGONEK, in which he explains the excessive numbers of victims during the years of the revolution as the lack of culture and recklessness of the Russian people. The novel by V. Grossman "Life and Fate," whose black leitmotif barely hides the enmity toward the Russian people. All these are examples of the same kind and they eloquently illustrate that phenomenon whose name is Russophobia...

The main thing in perestroyka is that we should not look at the person. We say: the foundation of perestroyka is glasnost and democracy. And these are the ideological and political guarantees for perestroyka.

And all perestroyka in its mature and meaningful sense is labor, labor and still more labor.

Moral labor assumes education, high standards for the worker himself and his conscientiousness and honesty, and a developed sense of worth, and last, but by no means least, sobriety.

So let us talk about sobriety. The authors of many articles published in the periodical press in connection with the historic decree—I do not hesitate to use these high-flown words—on the struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism, and the most important measures aimed

at restricting the production and sale of alcohol, have read lectures on the history of the alcohol issue in Russia, tea drinking, amateur concerts and so forth.

But what of labor, inspired, creative labor directed always toward the achievement of the highest results, labor, when people work not only with their hands but also their minds—can this kind of labor not be an effective means in the struggle against drunkenness?

In light of the above we regard as quite justified the materials on the pages of NASH SOVREMENNİK attuning people to the struggle against drunkenness rather than repeating and yielding to this evil, which during the period of stagnation became the main object of our "daily labor concerns."

The editorial office has received a huge amount of mail about these pieces. It would be impossible to read them all at one sitting; now we do not hear those unassuming letters written most often by mothers and wives, but the groan of "help me, save me!"

And here, in the September issue of OGONEK this year I suddenly read: "What Price Sobriety?" A huge headline that leaps out at you. I do not believe my eyes: it's probably a mistake... I read it again. No, that is what it says: "What Price Sobriety?" After I read it I involuntarily think: what prompted this article? Fear, perhaps. Yes, that's it, fear! The author of the article and those inspiring him seem very alarmed: suddenly the Russian people are indeed sobering up, and when they have sobered up, they think: who was hitting them over the head with the bottle for so many years? And why?

The 1985 decree must "be recognized as erroneous"; without beating about the bush the OGONEK author states that since the anti-alcohol campaign has become a regular thing, as Academician Abalkin said, "there is a colossal hole in the economy."

Well, we shall see how OGONEK and Abalkin plug the "hole" in the economy with the hole in the pocket of every family.

And it continues in a quite vague way: "To judge from everything, we have lost the present anti-alcohol campaign..."

I would like to ask this of the OGONEK editorial office: and what have you done to help us win rather than lose this campaign? And why, before printing the article "What Price Sobriety?" which discredits the temperance movement, did you not print another, showing the opposing view—"What Price Drunkenness?"—and cite other statistics that you deliberately omitted? And not insult Russian people by hinting that for them the struggle against drunkenness is hopeless because (I quote) "as many recent works in genetics have shown, alcoholism is passed on from the father and mother and not from monkeys."

In V. Lakshin's article, with the ambiguous headline "In the Wake," timed for the 19th All-Union Party Conference, the journal OGONEK accused NASH SOVREMENNİK of a number of anti-perestroika efforts moving along in the wake of Nina Andreyeva. You will all recall that Nina Andreyeva's position was criticized in a PRAVDA editorial. You will therefore agree that this is a serious, even very serious accusation. During Stalin's time (and even much later) this would have been quite enough to break up the editorial office and annihilate the journal. And I think that OGONEK was counting on this. And I would like to note something else. By branding its opponents with the word Stalinism in its published pieces, in its struggle against its opponent the OGONEK leadership has resorted to means and methods borrowed precisely from Stalinism.

It evidently hoped that not everything about the practice of Stalinism has yet been forgotten, and that the old trumps can be used in a new game. Baklanov was to have played these trump cards, and not just anywhere but from the dais of the 19th All-Union Party Conference. It did not happen. The essentially unsuccessful orator was driven from the dais.

There is more. The OGONEK criticisms, particularly from the female battalion formed there over the past 2 or 3 years, have, waving their clenched fists, reminded us a hundred times perhaps of the well-known "Letter of the Eleven" that played an allegedly fatal role in NOVYY MIR's persecution.

We decided to give readers the opportunity to acquaint themselves thoroughly with this letter, which is published in issue No 1, 1989. In full! Down to the last comma!

Let me add just a few words on this subject.

Our opponents (and they also include SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE and many others), beautifully and nobly showing their outrage over the persecution of NOVYY MIR during the sixties, are in their anger failing or unwilling to note in what a refined manner they are persecuting the journal NASH SOVREMENNİK during the eighties, sometimes with total lack of argument resorting to unpardonable falsehood and slander, the pinning on of labels and other methods. For lack of time I shall not cite examples. Everyone remembers them.

We have still not told our readers about the sources of this persecution, and even the hatred. Let me say this candidly. But, God be praised, even without us they are beginning to understand whose dog is growling... And the readers are the people. The final word always goes to them.

V. Persianov, doctor of economic sciences and professor at the Moscow Institute of Management imeni S. Ordzhonikidze, presented a second report at the plenum.

[Passage omitted]

A dangerous new illusion of the low cost and secondary priority of the boons of nature is being created. Underestimation of the true cost of natural resources is leading to a situation in which only the semblance of growth in prosperity is being created, while in fact it is in decline.

The fat volumes of the draft justifying the efficiency of the atomic power station at Chernobyl seemed quite respectable. But alas! the realities of the terrible catastrophe were not shown in the economists' generalized indicator. The cleanup operation has already cost R8 billion. Some scientists believe that this figure must be at least doubled. From what some scientists are saying the impression is being created that we cannot get along without nuclear power engineering. It now satisfies 11 or 12 percent of the country's demand for electric power. Meanwhile, we are losing about the same amount of energy in the general-purpose networks. Writers, commentators and scientists who raise the question of a fundamental solution to the problem of nuclear power engineering are undoubtedly right. And if our country can raise the question of banning nuclear weapons, then it must also talk banning nuclear power engineering.

Because of economic miscalculations the national economy suffered enormous material losses during the course of the wasteful consolidation of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, the liquidation of thousands of the small villages deemed unpromising, and the development of gigantic industrial complexes, superpowerful machines, electric power stations and the like. All those decisions were substantiated with the help of old methodologies, while the new methodology approved early this year by the Academy of Sciences and the State Committee for Science and Technology is just the same, alike as two peas in a pod.

In their calculations the economists have not learned that the losses in time and money on the construction of Baykal-Amur Mainline go far beyond the draft estimates: the efficiency of the billions of rubles used to lay the rail still remains insignificant, if not negative (taking the ecological factor into account). An additional R900 million are required just to eliminate the miscalculations in planning. Operation of the Baykal-Amur Mainline is costing the Ministry of Railways R200 million annually. This is the final outcome of the heroism of millions of people, first and foremost young people. Academician A.G. Aganbegyan has a direct involvement in the problems of the Baykal-Amur Mainline. He has traveled there repeatedly during its construction and it is first and foremost to him that the question should be addressed: how will this main railroad line live under the new management conditions?

[Passage omitted]

The plenum elected A. Larionov, V. Lichutin, Yu. Prokushev and A. Salutskiy secretaries of the RSFSR Writers Union Board.

The plenum adopted a resolution, which is published below.

### Plenum Resolution

18000440b Moscow *LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA*  
in Russian No 51, 23 Dec 88 p 5

[Text]

### The RSFSR Writers Union Plenum Resolution

In the revolutionary renewal of society a noticeable role is being played by literature, in particular commentary, which has today become an important and recognized form in the development of social thinking. In the best works of this genre the successes, complexities and contradictions of the period of perestroika are being analyzed and commentary is helping in the deeper understanding of the course of development in socioeconomic processes and actively influencing the shaping of public opinion.

While noting the growing role of commentary, which at the present stage has become a vanguard genre in literature, the plenum notes that the successes in this genre have been reached through the joint efforts of all generations of Soviet writers, all literature and social trends and all genres—prose writers, poets, critics, playwrights. Soviet writers are united in their understanding of the aims and tasks of perestroika and fully support the efforts of the party in the revolutionary renewal of society and the line of the 19th All-Union Party Conference. Attempts to categorize writers and supporters of opponents of perestroika are artificial. The plenum considers that the discussion of specific ways for the renewal of society taking place in commentary and in the environment of the creative intelligentsia is a normal democratic process that promotes consolidation of social forces on a principled, creative basis. In this connection special importance attaches to the creation of possibilities for equal dialogue with mutual respect among all literature and social trends, in order to compare different viewpoints for the sake of the socialist transformation of society on socialist foundations. Accordingly, the attempts by certain mobile mass media to claim for themselves a monopoly right to defend any particular viewpoint, thus opposing the standards of dialogue and being at variance with democracy, are impermissible. Now is not the time to be concerned only with personal ambitions; together, in dispute and discussion we must help the party to deepen the process of perestroika.

The plenum notes the growing role of the Russian republic and regional literary and social journals, which are today becoming true spokesmen for public opinion,

and it is considered that they must be decisively supported, including also the equalizing of royalties. Under the conditions of extended democracy and rights for local organs, the importance of the republic and regional journals is growing even more.

The tireless nature conservation activity of the Russian journals deserves special support. The diktat of other departments and the old methods in the utilization of natural resources are at variance with the interests of the country and are undermining its economic might. In order to return the economy to the individual a radical break with the existing system of planning and political consideration of the "progress and nature" problem under the conditions of full glasnost and giving due consideration to public opinion are required.

Recognizing this and taking into account the proposals and wishes expressed, the RSFSR Writers Union Board plenum resolves as follows:

To accelerate adoption of a law on the press that guarantees protection for authors against the willfulness of bureaucrats. Without this, commentators will be unable to exert any active influence on perestroika and it will be difficult to stop the harm that this is doing to the nation.

The Russian Federation, which in contrast to other union republics, unites dozens of peoples speaking different languages, should have its own journals along the lines of OGONEK and DRUZHBA NARODOV. Our proposal is not at variance with the spirit of the time, one of whose chief concerns is improving inter-ethnic relations, and we hope that this will finally be satisfied.

To approve, support and expand the initiative of the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants and the Book Trade and the "Sovetskiy pisatel," "Sovetskaya Rossiya," "Sovremennik" and other publishing houses that have found it possible to publish in an "express way," within a few months, books offering commentaries that are most important for the cause of revolutionary renewal.

To recognize as necessary the creation of conditions for the activity of commentators also at the local level—in the autonomous republics and kray, oblast and other major centers and cities; to which end application will be made to the proper authorities to restore oblast printing plants wherever they have been eliminated.

To request the appropriate authorities to take up again consideration of the question of creating a Russian sociopolitical and literary and art journals for the central non-Chernozem Russian oblasts and the old historical and cultural centers of Russia.

Guided by these considerations, the plenum asks the authorities to approve for radio and television Russian channels that would carry material on the economy and culture and the problems of inter-ethnic relations and

the demographic and social problems of numerically small peoples in the Federation. In this event, enormous cultural forces have been secured to speak from an all-Russian tribune for the oblasts and republics, including writers who have grown up there during the years of Soviet power.

The plenum considers that royalties in the central and republic journals should be equal. Any other solution will be discrimination against writers in the nationality republics.

To submit for national discussion the project for the construction of a Volga-Chogray canal, which will inevitably lead to irreversible consequences and deserves the same fate as that meted out by the people to the plan to divert the northern rivers.

The plenum considers that the Russian countryside is in a parlous condition: without major additional capital investment found from halting the 300,000 optional construction sites being worked on in the country today the Food Program will not be implemented.

To recommend commentators Mikhail Antonov and Vasilii Selyuchin, whose commentaries and articles have been a notable phenomenon in literature and public life, for admission to the membership of the USSR Writers Union.

#### **Discussants Attack Reform Publications**

*18000440c Moscow LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA  
in Russian No 52, 30 Dec 88 pp 3-11*

[unattributed report: "Restructuring and Commentary: RSFSR Writers' Board Plenum"]

[Excerpts] The discussion was opened by V. Sidorov.

When the flood gates of glasnost first opened up it was as though all the moral dams broke. Abuse and vitriol became the fashion and when reinforced by the mass media they sometimes inspire terror and revulsion in people's souls. It is as though the words of Jesus Christ as printed in the gospel were projected onto our situation: "Let anyone among you who is without sin cast the first stone." As we know, the crowd, embarrassed by these words, dispersed, and not a single stone was cast at the wretched woman. I fear, however, that the level of our conscience has dropped so low, even in comparison with ancient Judea, that we will throw stones even though we may be burdened with thousands of sins.

But if you cast your stone you had better understand that you risk evoking a counterattack of rocks against yourself. This is what happened with the current editor of OGONEK, Vitaliy Korotich. I refer the uninitiated to issue No 18 of the journal POLITICHESKOYE OBRAZOVANIYE and No 12 of the journal ZHURNALIST.

When calling for repentance from others, you must provide an example through your own repentance, and not try to avoid it by using intricate subterfuges and all kinds of juggling, as Korotich does, and not only Korotich. So far there are no people on our horizon who are absolutely without sin.

I cannot get rid of the impression that OGONEK through articles by Rassadin and people of his ilk like Natalya and Tatyana Ivanova are deliberately provoking public opinion, testing it, as it were, for durability. I shall not speak about the level of these articles. For me there is no doubt that they are reinforced neither by the authority of the name (of course, this is not the main thing) nor by the authority of the thought. In general this is surface froth, which conceals, however, deep processes. But how does one explain such recklessness, such obvious cynicism and arbitrariness regarding people and facts on the party of our new extremists? In my opinion, there is only one explanation—their sense of their own impunity, their confidence that nobody will seriously respond to them.

This situation has taken form before our very eyes. We recall how at the dawn of the restructuring energetic new, highly radical people took over the leadership of the mobile mass media (OGONEK, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, and others). Obviously this was correct because it was necessary to carry out the destructive work rapidly, undermining the established stereotypes and the ossified dogmas. The group of like-thinkers ardently—and, incidentally, with advantage to the prospects of the general cause—undertook the destructive work.

But very quickly not only the positive aspects of this process, but also the negative sides were revealed. The like-thinkers, having mastered the means for the formation of public opinion, felt as though they were monopolists and began to develop their own stereotypes which, in their opinion, were mandatory for everyone. Glasnost was transformed into a one-way street. The conditions for normal polemics were destroyed.

And indeed, what real possibility do I have, for example? The greatest one is to publish in MOSKOVSKIY LITERATOR, whose circulation does not exceed 2,000. Or I can make my voice heard in a tribune such as today's, but the text of my speech if it is published will cut to the point of being unrecognizable. I assure you that it does not make any difference if you use a shot gun against armed transporters and tanks which in the blink of an eye can fire at you with a machine gun or burn you with napalm. Try to do battle under these conditions—I shall allow myself to borrow Pushkin's expression—with "unreasonable Khazars." Try to reason with them.

We speak about socialist pluralism, but we ourselves have not yet grown to the level of bourgeois democracy whereby various groups and segments of the population have every right to express their opinion. And what

happens here? If you are a Stalinist—although this, we assume, still has to be proven—there is no forum for you. If you—God forbid—are a proponent of the Pamyat society—although nobody has clearly explained the situation in that society—a taboo is placed on you as though you were a leper. And yet the disease is driven inside this way, and subsequently it will inevitably be transformed into bleeding ulcers and open sores.

In any case if there is a "yellow" OGONEK, as Vasilii Belov has christened it, there should also be an alternative OGONEK—not a cheap magazine, but a serious and substantial one. The question of mass media which would reflect the entire spectrum of today's social attitudes has ripened and even become overripe. In my opinion, when it comes to this issue we have made one mistake which must be rectified as quickly as possible. And if this is suddenly not a random incident but the conscious and deliberate policy of our party leadership, we must honestly and candidly inform the leadership that this policy is incorrect and unreasonable for it contains within it the seeds of future unrest and conflicts whose consequences are difficult to anticipate.

To me it does not seem to be an accident that recently there has been a clear tendency toward idealization of the twenties; some people are inclined to see here an almost tempting model of our society, ignoring the ambiguity and contradictoriness of this period in history. I do not know about you, but I was extremely impressed by the article in KOMMUNIST entitled "Old Myths, New Fears," which was deservedly reprinted in LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA, in this case according to the principle of the sergeant's widow who flogged herself. And yet the article, in my opinion, does not meet the standards of such a highly esteemed organ as we have come to consider KOMMUNIST to be, for it is not profound and it is extremely subjective. In particular, it takes the twenties under its protection. The idea is expressed that there is no evidence that they were a time of "exterminating everything national and classical." But excuse me! excuse me!—this is how I should like to respond to the nameless authors of the article. If you are in your right mind and really are that naive, then go read the newspapers from those years. Does it really not make your hair stand on end to see the threatening appeals to destroy the Winter Palace and other architectural treasures of Leningrad, since they were supposed to have been symbols of the autocracy, and to erect cubo-futurist buildings in their place? Does your heart really not pound from the constantly repeated demand to eliminate the use of the revolting word "Russia" since there is such a pleasant sounding abbreviation as RSFSR? Remember what the situation was with the democratic principle during those years. Entire groups of people who were declared to be socially alien elements were deprived of the right to vote (including clergy, who were said to have unearned income). The rights of peasants were also encroached upon because the country villages had different electoral qualifications from those in the cities. And innocent blood was also spilled. All that was needed



for an international conflict to loom up on the horizon and immediately for preventive purposes they arrested, say, White officers and they were shot without a trial or investigation. So the seeds of future repressions and illegal acts were sown precisely in the twenties. Why was it necessary to embellish history and idealize the time of domination of the members of the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers who, incidentally, remind one in some ways of the new OGONEK contingent. (And in fact, if the previous members of the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers did not like the word "Russia," the not unknown author of OGONEK and MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI is disturbed by the words of our current hymn: "The inviolable union of free republics was united forever by great Rus." How can one use such words as "Rus," not to mention in conjunction with "great"!)

In general we all tip-toe around this problem: we try not to notice and not to speak of the malignant tumor that is eating away at people's minds, which is called—Russophobia.

Russophobia is nothing new in the West. Approximately by the end of the seventies it had become a developed ideological-political concept. In order to destroy the Soviet system it was necessary to destroy the foundation that cemented it together, namely the Russian people. "Everything bad comes from the Russians"—a new branch of the campaign against our country was begun with this slogan. Incidentally, it caused a fairly marked split among Russians abroad. The editor of the newspaper RUSSKAYA MYSL in Paris, Zinaida Shakhovskaya, retired as a sign of protest. Yes, she was anti-Soviet but she resolutely refused to besmirch the Russian people simply because they were Russian.

When you read certain of our newspapers and journal you cannot escape the feeling that we have now taken up the relay baton of Russophobia. For people are prepared to attach the label of "Black One Hundred" to everyone who is concerned and begins to speak seriously about the fate of Russia and the tragic position of her ecology and culture. For they are glad to grasp onto any negative fact, sometimes nonexistent ones (let us just recall the story of the letters from the "fighters" for Pamyat to G. Balanov) in order to blow it up to the level of global Russian chauvinism.

Until the Law on the Press is adopted, everything is possible in our press. It is possible to accuse of chauvinism a people who never arranged for their own welfare at the expense of others and who are prepared to give someone else the shirt off their back. It is possible not to notice the obvious fact that the standard of living of the Russian people is lower than the standard of living of other Union republics and that Russia is an unequal party in the union of republics. Think what it means with a one party system not to have one's own party central committee in the republic. This means that there is nobody to turn to in a difficult time.

But, moving from the general to the particular, I shall make the following suggestions for the consideration of participants in the plenum.

1. Support the decision of the secretariat of the board of the RSFSR Writers Union in Ryazan concerning the creation of a Russian weekly magazine like OGONEK and the opening of a Russian television channel.

2. Raise the status of LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA. Update the weekly's editorial staff and editorial board. In its statement accompanying the reprinting of the article from KOMMUNIST, the editorial board of LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA admits that when turning over the secretarial notes of the traveling secretariat of the board of the RSFSR Writers Union, it acted in the spirit of the old times of stagnation. Let us admit it. But, after all, even the reprinting of the article, which the editorial staff perceives as a directive from above and therefore stands at attention, shows that again it is acting in the spirit of the times of stagnation. And what will happen if tomorrow, say, PRAVDA criticizes KOMMUNIST? Another 180-degree turn? This is why I am raising before the plenum the question of confidence in the current leadership of LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA. I think that it has forfeited the moral right to lead a press organ of Russian literary people.

3. Third—the simplest and perhaps the most utopian. While approving of the principle of real glasnost, to publish in the next few issues of LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA in unabridged form the speeches of participants in the present plenum. This would serve as a hopeful sign of the liberation of the Russian word, which—it must be admitted—is under heavy pressure and in a number of cases under a complete ban.

[Passage omitted]

Commentary undoubtedly plays a leading role today—this is the way S. Shumskiy (Tyumen) began his speech. There is no question about this, it is the behest of the times, although the times have disintegrated, have become heathen, have been pulled apart, and where we shall end up nobody knows precisely. In any case one thing is clear—we have often repeated in vain: "You will not deceive the people, you will not deceive nature," but we have engaged precisely in deceiving both the people and nature.

The situation is very serious and dramatic, and I wish to touch upon our Tyumen region, which I represent. We are providing the entire country with petroleum and gas; this immense wealth does indeed perhaps seem inexhaustible, but there is an end to it, it can be seen. But we have now lived to a point where it is simply obscene to speak about this wealth because nature—the main provider of our wealth—is writhing in agony. Do you know that in our region alone it will take 43 billion rubles to restore the wealth that has been destroyed. This is how we have mutilated here—this nature.

And now this process is continuing because we are increasing the rates of extraction not by improving technology, but through new deposits, which ends up in the most complete destruction of nature for mankind and for the entire region.

Anatoliy Salutskiy today said that we have had enough illusions. But it seems to me that illusions rule our lives, illusions influence us in some way. And very strongly. Two weeks ago the editorial staff of the journal NASH SOVREMENNIK came to visit us. In a single response all the halls were overfilled—in the house of political education, the library, even the prison colony where an immense crowd of prisoners were present—everywhere people listened to the people from NASH SOVREMENNIK with a great deal of attention because it expressed the truth. And there is nothing that can replace the truth. And to create the illusions which are created, for example, by the magazines OGONEK and ZNAMYA, for example—means to go against the truth, to create chaos and muddy the water from which it would be possible to catch certain little fish. And the positions of these magazines are based on this alone.

And specifically I think that for one case of slander which I wish to call a crime—and it is not slander when an anonymous picture is published—it is necessary to go to court. And I would like to suggest going to precisely these agencies because there has been a violation of the Ukase of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet stating that no attention should be paid to anonymous letters.

Everything that concerns the position of OGONEK, wherever the water flows—dirty water!—on our writers' minds and whatever is difficult to figure out, OGONEK can now be called the "little fire under our socialism." How much of this can we take? We must fight against it in every way.

I wish to deal specifically with our Tyumen business. I wish to go to the secretariat of the board of the RSFSR Writers Union and request that they include in the plan measures for creating a memorial to Petr Pavlovich Yershov so that we can conduct measures at a high level. He deserves this.

We must specifically restore his house as we restored the houses of Fedorov and Yesenin, we must restore his house and make it the Yershov museum.

Here is the second suggestion I wish to make. At the October meeting of the secretariat Yuriy Vasilyevich Bondarev himself said that it is necessary to make the suggestion of restoring the oblast publishing houses. Comrades, we are in complete spiritual bankruptcy, because the oblast's economic potential is enormous, but we are impoverished in the complete sense of the word. There is no publishing house, there is no almanac. Our organization is young, strong, and capable, and many of our young people are quite close to the union.

We must take into account that we have two national okrugs. We have small nationalities who will die out like all small nationalities. We are now speaking about restoring any nation in general. They are right to demand very sternly and to pointedly raise questions of restoring their cultural traditions, their cultures, everything that they have lost during the years of disintegration.

I wish to conclude my statement also from the sphere of illusions. Why do we entrust the sacred cause of educating the young to people who are not capable of educating the young? For example, last year we made a proposal to the secretariat of the board of the RSFSR Writers Union to send our very respected essayist Yevgeniy Grigoryevich Ananyev to Pitsunda to lead a seminar, but the Union paid no attention to our proposal. He has been going there for 10 years now. In 15 years he has not published a single little book. Why do we trust him; after all we have worthy, efficient people who could be entrusted with this matter. We do not need illusions.

[Passage omitted]

The next to speak was G. Goryshin (Leningrad)

[Passage omitted]

I should like to say these things. And if I am allowed to I shall make a statement regarding the very strong speeches, declarations, and expressions that have been heard here with respect to the Russian people, our destiny, and the magazine OGONEK. I must admit that where I live such discussions are not accepted and are even impossible, and therefore my speech is like a view from the outside. What seem strange to me are the claims of one side or another, one group or another, or an entire clan to speak the last word, to represent the last instance of truth. It never entered my mind that the position of Korotich or OGONEK presented a significant danger to the fate or reputation of the Russian people. Such ideas never entered my mind. When the issue is stated this way it seems somewhat excessive and superfluous, for disintegration and fanning of the fire that has been kindled within us ourselves, in my opinion, is quite unproductive in our time.

[Passage omitted]

The floor was turned over to M. Antonov.

I understand our sorrow concerning the disaster that befell our fraternal Armenian people, but I should like to draw your attention to the "earthquake" that has lasted for several years and is destroying our Russian land. The earth is trembling in the lower reaches of the Volga where the Volga-Chorgay and Volga-Don-Bis canals are being built, and, according to the plan, water should be running through the second canal next year. If we allow this, the diversion of northern waters will be inevitable.

And this will lead to creating swamps in the north and salinizing the chernozem of the south, and dooming our country to a position of forever being buyers of grain abroad.

I should like to hope that our writers, who have exhibited so much energy in fighting against the idea of diverting the waters and have been placated with the idea that the corresponding decision would be rescinded, will take this battle to the end, for this idea has not merely failed to die out; it is being promoted with even greater energy, only not from the northern, but from the southern end.

Here a good deal has been said about the impoverished position in which we find our rural areas, our culture, its lower-level institutions, and when we request help from the higher levels, we are told that there is no money. Here is where the money is going—for the construction of those canals which nobody needs and which will bring nothing but harm to the country.

Commentary has indeed played an immense role in the stage of restructuring which could more correctly be called the stage of recovery of sight. But as for its creative stage, our contribution to this cause—and we must recognize this—is still extremely meager.

Moreover, it seems to me that we have somewhat altered the genre and instead of commentarial articles at the present time we are writing mainly fairy tales. Fairy tales about the present—to the effect that the difficult situation in the country's economy is characterized primarily by a reduction of the growth rates of production and the national income while in reality we know that these rates can very easily be increased by producing products that nobody needs.

And in reality the entire tragedy consists in that we are ruining our country, transforming one region after another into zones that are unsuitable for habitation by man. We have allowed the national wealth to be pumped from the public sector into the private sector. More and more we are transforming our country into a raw-material appendage of the capitalist countries, which ultimately threatens to put us into the position of a colony.

We are creating fairy tales about the past, having in mind that we once had a wise leader and then came leaders who were not so good, and as a result things are not going as well as they should. We are creating fairy tales about the future, assuming that if we grant the unlimited possibility of utilizing commodity and monetary relations, everything else will be done by his majesty the ruble, and tomorrow we shall have a flourishing country.

We must tell people the bitter but quite necessary truth. And this truth consists in that what is sick about us is not simply the economy, and as Nikolay Shmelev announced on television yesterday, but the country itself, the people

are sick, their soul has been violated, and their moral foundations undermined. And unless this foundation is restored, all measures of a purely economic nature are useless...

We now need a real breakthrough in the area of theory, and not abstract constructs, but an enrichment of this theory with spiritual and moral values of all peoples of the planet, and above all our great Russian people.

Allow me to give just one example. We have been running our economy for more than 70 years without the least philosophical foundation, and yet it was in our country there once appeared by book by S. N. Bulgakov, "The Philosophy of Management"—a unique work in world literature in which man's management activity is regarded from cosmic positions, from the standpoint of the calling of all mankind.

If you look at the article entitled "Philosophy of Economics" published recently in *KOMMUNIST* (its author, O. R. Latsis is the first deputy editor-in-chief) you will see how far we have fallen in this respect, how much more primitive our judgments have become on the basic issues of economic activity.

We are the only one of the great countries of the world that does not have its own national goal. We have lost our ideals. I have in mind not those ideals whose achievement can be put off until very distant times, but those which should raise the people to great accomplishments today.

The works of Russian thinkers of antiquity and the 19th-20th centuries are being studied and published in immense editions in all civilized countries of the world except for their glorious homeland. Of course, it would be easy for me not to speak in this forum, where it is possible to devote a couple of minutes to the subject, and then give you a copy of my article, but, unfortunately, the first article from this series was just rejected from the first issue of the journal *MOSKVA*.

Who is responsible to the readers for this? Who will compensate for the moral harm caused to the journal?

In conclusion I should like to respond to *KOMMUNIST* which, in my opinion, quite groundlessly subjected to disparaging criticism the traveling secretariat of the board of the Russian Writers Union that convened in Ryazan.

I in particular received most of it. *KOMMUNIST* subjected two of my statements to destructive and degrading criticism. I sent *KOMMUNIST* a letter and I am suggesting that we conduct an honest, sincere, and open discussion of these issues. If *KOMMUNIST* thinks that I am wrong in my assertion that for 65 years Marxism has not developed in our country, I suggest that the journal print my question and its answer to it: with what great achievements since the last works of Lenin up to

the beginning of the current restructuring have our Soviet social scientists enriched our theory (with an indication of the authors, if possible) and, the main thing, to what consequences has the application of these innovations led in the practice of socialist construction? How with an entire army of social scientists have we brought the country to this pre-crisis condition? And further—if the journal denies that we have had an immense spiritual and moral lapse on the part of the broad segments of our population, a lapse that is written about with alarm by outstanding figures in domestic culture, I wish to ask the KOMMUNIST editors this question: what spiritual and moral values has our Soviet social science developed to replace the moral absolutes which they have discarded as unnecessary rubbish? How equivalent is the commandment "Thou shalt not steal" to the principle "Thou shalt not get caught?"

Why is our country one of the first in the world with respect to crime and why has organized crime appeared here? Why have several generations of youth, and not only youth, been lost to our culture?

Then A. Turkov spoke.

I agree with Mikhail Antonov's statement regarding the diversion of the rivers. I recall that at the last congress of RSFSR writers when developing the resolution they especially raised the point of the alarm of the writer—and not only the writer—community regarding the notorious plan to divert the waters.

I recall that at that time among the supporters or simply people who were following the congress there was an almost skeptical attitude; I do not wish to offend anyone, but perhaps one could say here—snobbish: "What is this? They are supposed to be talking about literature, and here they are talking about this."

At the same time I think that one of the most important points of the work of that congress was the powerful statement of an entire group of writers, which was supported by the entire congress, against this tragic plan, which to this day does not wish to and cannot sink into nonexistence. And I think it is the business of this very plenum and of the society in general to continue to fight to eliminate this and other plans like it.

[Passage omitted]

I am very disturbed by the breaking up into camps and the reciprocal unfairness.

I have my own complaints against the criticism section of NASH SOVREMENNİK. But I agree with those who say that it is impossible to forget the merits of this journal which has unleashed the campaign against the diversion of the northern rivers. For they have published excellent prose and Rasputin's "Matera" and this list could be continued: for instance, Shipunov's essays.

Sergey Vasilyevich Vikulov will tell you that I have always said that it is an excellent journal in one part, in another part it might not be good enough, or, perhaps, not even good at all. But let us be fair. Let us recognize the merit, which cannot be taken away, and if it were taken away it would be dishonest.

On the other hand, I would apply the same thing to other areas. What disputes, even bitter battles, have surrounded OGONEK! Unfortunately, I did not hear this statement myself, but I am told that the word "yellow" was used with respect to this journal. This word was used on television by Vasily Ivanovich Belov who said that previously the journal had been "red" but now it was "yellow."

Dear comrades, let us look the truth in the face. Was the OGONEK of Safronov's time a militant journal? What did this journal carry with it? I think that this is a very questionable remark, that the journal was good and now it has become bad. I too have complaints against the current OGONEK. It seems that in some places it is beginning to pander to the readers. But still the journal is doing a good deal and is trying to do more. The journal is trying to awaken reader energy and it has produced a number of brilliant and strong articles. Let us argue with them but let us be fair!

The same thing is true of the journal ZNAMYA, which has not been through the best period of its history during the past 10 years. And now this journal is also changing. There are attacks against it, which I was sorry to read in the article by Vladimir Bushin in MOLODAYA GVARDIYA. In general he abuses the scandal potential of his statements, whether they be against ZNAMYA or, in another case, against G. M. Markov, against whom I too have had complaints. The desire for scandal, picking fights, the desire to jab a little deeper—in my opinion, we should get rid of all this.

In our press, perhaps in the narrow press—MOSKOVSKIY LITERATOR—in connection with the elections to the publishing house Sovetskiy pisatel, an unpleasant campaign is suddenly being developed against Anatoliy Strelyanny, a person, perhaps, with his own quirks and in some ways quick tempered, but a person who is doing enough for our culture and our economy. Why are people taking pot shots at him? Let us say that they really are honest elections, around which there is a pre-election battle, and not a desire to compromise our comrade in some way.

Why write in the journal NASH SOVREMENNİK in the article of A. Kazintsev that Granin did a good deal to separate (!) our society. As they say, fear God! This is the author of "Blockade Book," this is the author of "Zubra"! This is Granin, who published articles about mercy. How can this be? They used to say that in this case you do not bear the cross!

Finally, I have my own complaints against LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA. But I think that, in the first place, it is more difficult for this newspaper to survive than it was for its former neighbor on Tsvetnoy Boulevard, since it is in a more difficult situation with respect to honorariums, and so forth. They are making some concessions, but still they are trying to work and the work they are doing is not bad at all. Today we are saying here: the provinces, we must think about the provinces. Comrades, let us recall they they have a number of columns, such, for example, as "Literary Prospects," "Prospects of Art," and others. They have printed quite a bit of material from our literary heritage as well. They consistently adhere to a policy of elucidating national literatures. Remember that there have been a number of roundtables, and I have participated in several of them and have seen how this was done. It is not simple to do this, and, incidentally, the theme of commentary took its place at these roundtables back when it did not occupy such a place in our lives.

Therefore I think that we must be fair and not be in a hurry to pin on mutual labels, and certainly not with any fierce administrative reactions. Let us work like that.

[Passage omitted]

V. Bondarenko opened the discussion on the second day of the Plenum.

Today I am reading that the eminent dramatist Viktor Rozov declares that he is not proud of the fact that he is Russian. I read that the eminent Belorussian prose writer Ales Adamovich calls his homeland the Belorussia of the modern (Vandeya). I read how Vitaliy Korotich, having moved from Kiev to Moscow, is disdainful about all modern Ukrainian culture. The sense of the motherland is deliberately being debunked. A sense of duty to the motherland is denied even from early years. It is as though many newspaper commentators include all great moral and civic concepts among concepts of stagnation. The new "liberators," with the help of the mass media want as quickly as possible to rid primarily the younger generation of the "heavy yoke of conscience," the "excessive burden of civic consciousness," and even such concepts as "state consciousness" and "consciousness of supreme power" and they cause heart attacks and the severest headaches in all kinds of Rassadins and Sarnovs.

The feeling for the motherland dictates respect for its protectors and admiration for its glorious heroes. A feeling for the motherland is genetically inherent in each nation. In the United States they are proud of Lincoln and Washington, Edison and Faulkner, in France—Napoleon and de Gaulle, Joliot-Curie and Balzac. Every country has its own national heroes who symbolize the worth and honor of the nation. And every time there is a period of sharp changes in the society or a period of destabilization, there appear people who totally reject everything from the past and nominate for the role of

new authorities people with feet of clay. I do not think that the new names for the propagandists are so important; it is always possible to replace one with another. But there should be less sanctity, less heroism, fewer national symbols. The principle of the moral relativity of everything is important here. One can fight in the Red Army and then in a German tank division and it does not mean anything. We call it complex destiny.

One can commit a crime and demand praise for it. You can change citizenship several times, and not at all for political reasons, and today demand that the motherland ask your forgiveness. One can say one thing in the Western press and quite the opposite in the native Soviet press.

For instance, today all the magazines are interested in articles by literary scholars who left for the West during the period of stagnation. Even their departure is declared to be an act of heroism, an act of resistance. In KONTINENT A. Sinyavskiy wrote: "Bitch-Russia, you will also answer for this!" The abuse of Russia by the wave of the third emigration amazed all of the Western world. Why is it that today when publishing poems and prose by I. Brodskiy, N. Korzhavin, and V. Voynovich we say nothing about their social position, why do we shamefacedly turn away from their commentary which is known throughout the world? We do not wish to print, for example, the "Open Letter to Naum Korzhavin" from the most eminent German prose writer Heinrich Boll, who rejects the total antisocialism of our dissidents. Could it be that Heinrich Boll is a Stalinist too?

The article by Nina Andreyeva is no less restructured than an editorial from PRAVDA. Or does someone perhaps believe that such an article would have appeared during the years of stagnation? The censor would not have allowed it. This means that we are discussing the fact that N. Andreyeva's ideas about restructuring are different from those of the majority of members of our society. It is worth clarifying: do we need to give these minorities the right to express themselves? Or are we all for a unified point of view which is the most democratic, and no others are needed? Let us take the viewpoint concerning our compatriots abroad. Previously there was one, now there is another, but there is no diversity of opinions. There continues to be an abundant whitewashing of literary people who went abroad who are now being published. The newspaper KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE is printing the Nobel lecture of Iosif Brodskiy. There are many interesting ideas, but one essential thing is left out of the text—the equation of Lenin with Hitler in the series of tyrants of mankind. Excuse me, but Iosif Brodskiy did not whisper this idea under this breath, he did not hide it, he asserts it to the whole world. And when they bring him this issue of KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE he will read it and no longer believe in the restructuring, he will look with irony at how they are making him into an "unfortunate victim of Brezhnevism." He leaves the American academy as a sign of protest of the fact that they accepted Voznesenskiy there,



he responds insultingly to the efforts of Ch. Aytmatov from Issyk-Kul, and speaks disparagingly of his own NOVYY MIR article. Let us not conceal his true opinions from the readers of his verses.

Another example. The journal OKTYABR published a fairly good selection of poems by Naum Korzhavin.

Here they should discuss in the foreword the true contradictions between the poet and the society and the poet's refusal to accept the existing system. We read in B. Sarnov's introduction: "It is absurd and monstrous that a person who throughout his conscious life has had such a sense of himself and his place in the world... not conceiving of himself and his life outside Russia, outside her culture and her historical destiny is now forced to live far away from the motherland."

According to the version suggested by B. Sarnov, the poet does not conceive of himself outside the "historical destiny" of Russia, but as everyone knows: the historical destiny of Russia lies in socialism. And what are we to do having read the "Open Response to Naum Korzhavin" from the outstanding German writer Heinrich Boll? N. Korzhavin does not believe in any possibility of "democratic socialism" and considers everything negative in the life of the Soviet Union to be an immutable law of socialism. In his opinion, even the stable dictatorships like that in Chile are more human than the Soviet system. He defends only the capitalist system. Heinrich Boll absolutely does not agree with him, and in his response to Naum Korzhavin he says that the vices of the Soviet system lie namely in the inadequacy of socialism, in the deviations from its real essence, and he refuses to "...fasten his gaze only on the Soviet Union and see only in it the danger to the entire world." Describing this dispute in VOPROSY LITERATURY, D. Zatonskiy writes: "Perhaps, Bukovskiy and Korzhavin (Korzhavin supported the uncompromising position of Bukovskiy—V. B.) were offended most of all by the fact that it was as though Boll were pointing his finger at the functionary dogmatism that had gradually conquered them? After all they excluded from their portion a criticism of the social system within which they now exist, which they consider 'their own' to a much greater degree than the Western writer Boll did."

D. Zatonskiy can by no means be included with the proponents of Nina Andreyeva and even for Alla Latynina, who has a penchant for such labels, it would be difficult to call Heinrich Boll an "informer" pointing toward the antisocialist position of Naum Korzhavin.

Today when speaking about the cultural figures who have left the Soviet Union we have gone to the opposite extreme, which is perhaps even further from the truth. Stalinism and stagnation are to blame for everything and we consider encroachment on the artists' creative freedom to be the only reason for their departure. As though Vladimir Vysotskiy's creative freedom was not violated,

as though they did not fulminate against Fedor Abramov, as though they always went half way to meet Vasilii Shukshin. There could be no question of the guilt of those who left; it was only an internal impulse that had grown in them, their conscious rejection of the entire social system. Anyone who crossed over this edge, this boundary of perception of the surrounding reality, or who tired of the struggle—left. We shall not consider this betrayal, as was previously asserted, but we shall not declare it to be a great feat, as literary scholars are now trying to convince us it was. Even the French L'HUMANITE of 23 October 1987 wrote: "The members of the Nobel Prize committee are people who have been lured into politics... It can be expected that they will support the new processes taking place in the Soviet Union. Named at one time as one of the probable candidates for the prize was Chingiz Aytmatov, in whose creative work these changes were sharply reflected. But the selection of the Academy fell on Iosif Brodskiy. He is undoubtedly a worthy poet, but by awarding him the prize the Nobel committee mainly wanted to remind the world about the Soviet writers who in the recent past quarreled with Soviet authorities...."

They hoped that another political scandal would follow. Fortunately, those bad times had actually come to an end. We had one other Nobel prize winner in literature, a Russian emigrant, and all this is undoubtedly to the advantage of our domestic letters, making the world aware of them, but it is no accident that except for M. Sholokhov, all of our other prize winners at the time they were awarded the prizes were in some kind of opposition to the regime or the regime to them. When Iosif Brodskiy was awarded the Nobel Prize I was in Mexico on tour with the Malyy Theater. In the largest Latin American newspaper, EXCELSIOR, I published an article under the title "There are Better Poets in Russia than Brodskiy." Without denying the poet's talent, I pointed out the political nuances of the awarding of the prize. When I returned to Moscow I tried to publish this article in our newspapers: I did not succeed. There is a certain kind of glasnost we do not have even now. Insisting on publishing my answer in the Estonian newspaper MOLODEZH ESTONII, which clearly slandered me, I had to indicate that otherwise I would sent my response to the Scandinavian newspapers, which would gladly make room for it. The Western press was already filled with interviews with the Pamyat leaders, Boris Yeltsin and Nina Andreyeva. Nobody was shouting at the interviewers as they were shouting at SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA for publishing Andreyeva's article, and nobody was accusing them of being Stalinists. They want to know the opinions of various sides in order to approach the truth. Even today we are moving further away from it.

V. Bondarenko discussed the lot of the Soviet artist Mikhail Shemyakin, who departed for the United States, his activity abroad, and his political views.

We must accept our former compatriots as they actually are today—the speaker continued his train of thought.

Then they will really believe us. Instead of false friendship from people who are supposed to have been loyal to our system, who put up with the lie because of an oppressive feeling of nostalgia, because of a yearning to go back to the motherland for a week, because of a natural desire to publish and exhibit in the motherland, we must develop normal, true friendship among people, even if they are politically distant, even hostile to our system, but are linked to our country through historical, national, and family roots. It is impossible to calculate how much we have lost even economically because of our notorious (recall Surovtsev or Oskotskiy with their class truncheon) class approach to all people on earth.

Up until recently we considered all Russian colonies throughout the world to be hostile centers. There are so many Russian intellectuals, aristocrats, noblemen, merchants, engineers, cultural activists who have not accepted our system who, because of blood ties, because of an undying attraction to the land of their fathers would give us recommendations and advice, would create joint enterprises, would establish funds and museums. How difficult, almost impossible it was to bequeath to our country collections of pictures and the richest libraries, archives and entire buildings. Let us extend to them the hand of their native soil. And then it will no longer be necessary to make them out to be loyal people, citizens who are politically loyal to the Soviet system. For this is also that initial lie about victims of stagnation who were forced to depart. Those who left were the ones who ceased to be politically loyal to our society as a whole. They could have been oppressed or they could have been quite well off. V. Dudintsev was not published, but they were quite willing to publish A. Gladilin and A. Kuznetsov. The GULAG martyr and an excellent Russian writer Varlam Shalamov did not leave, but the head orchestra director Maksim Shostakovich did. Since we are coming closer to the truth, let us let go of the legend we have created concerning artists who were forced against their will to leave the motherland.

The floor was turned over to Yu. Rytkheu.

I am not an orator and did not intend to speak. But I think that what has happened at our plenum affects more than just Russian writers. The fact is that we are at the Plenum of the RSFSR Writers Union. I came to this plenum with great hopes. These hopes have largely been frustrated.

Today we are present at a plenum devoted to the journal NASH SOVREMENNİK. This should have been stated. This entire plenum, which is supported by doctors of sciences and the speech by the editor-in-chief of NASH SOVREMENNİK, is a reinforcement of the line propounded by the magazine. I am in favor of pluralism of opinions. I am very glad that the Russian writers have their own journal. This is a purely Russian journal. If you look at the list of members of the editorial board you will see that there is not a single representative of the

Russian nations. I am glad that the Russians have their own journal. But I am sorry that the other Russian nations do not have a literary-artistic journal.

I am largely in agreement even with the extreme viewpoints expressed in this journal. But how can one declare all the rest—OGONEK and ZNAMYA and NEVA and MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI—all are against restructuring? This is incorrect. And the only correct journal is NASH SOVREMENNİK.

I do not think that this is altogether true. We are now encountering some very difficult processes. That which we have buried inside, what has been called the remnants of nationalism, has now come to the surface. These are the most terrible remnants in a multinational state.

In the Bay of Providence in the hospital all the local residents were ordered to wash dishes except for the Russians. Or in the settlement of Novochapline a school director burned all the Eskimo books that were there. He said that from that time forward the Eskimo language would be stamped out from the Eskimo settlement.

Now they are trying to chip away at our restructuring. Each nation is declaring that it will carry out the restructuring separately and solve its own economic and social problems: the Estonians in their own way, the Latvians in their own way, and so forth. I think that the restructuring that faces us is so immense that even the largest nations cannot carry it out individually.

People's fronts are now being created in various places. The people's front that existed in Russia—the people's front of the leading intelligentsia, the people's front of revolutionaries along with the leading people of the outlying districts of Russia—unfortunately, has disintegrated today. Hence all the problems, all the extremist attitudes, all the offenses that should certainly not be found among writers. I do not think that this is just my own personal opinion or my own impression of our plenum which is not so optimistic.

Then N. Shundik spoke.

I would like so much for my opponents to get rid of their prejudices as much as possible and examine deeply my alarming idea. I ask you to try to rise up a level or two so that you can cast your dangerous conflict in a tone that is worthy of discussion.

Alas, I too have had to speak about the article in KOMMUNIST entitled "Old Myths, New Fears," under the rubric "Our Commentary." And in my cheerless reflections I shall refer not to the journal, which is dear to me, but only to the commentator, since I find it hard to accept the idea that this is the position held by the journal. I understand that this is naive, but it is easier on my spirit.

I was struck by the commentator's attitude toward the statement by Valentin Rasputin in our traveling secretariat meeting in Ryazan. "The expenditure of energy to sustain passions that are far from the real concerns of the people and the country at this difficult turning point in history weakens the participation of the creative intelligentsia in the restructuring." Excellent! I subscribe to every word of this reasoning.

But here I ask my first confused question. Is Valentin Rasputin really so removed from the concerns of the people? Is this the same Valentin Rasputin who declared himself to be a surprising example of true civic passion and self-sacrifice in his battle to save Baykal? And not only Baykal. And did Valentin Rasputin really not raise a rebellion against the profanation of socialism and socialist ideals by telling dispassionately and honestly the harsh truth about the tragedy of our peasants in "Farewell to Matera"?

The commentator rightly speaks about the fact that a position of permissiveness is unacceptable to us. I am even in favor of his sacred right, I quote: "...not to agree and to object to everything that is directed toward destruction of man, humanity, human values, and world civilization." But what does the commentator himself not agree with by trying to depict Valentin Rasputin as some kind of moss-covered grumbler, who irritates rock and rollers and certain prostitutes?

I recall this television picture. Coins have been scattered on the floor. A rock group is going wild, and with difficulty through the incredible noise one comes to understand that they are supposed to be protesting against accumulation, trampling on the coins with the portrait of Ilich on them. But if the director had had an urge to show his innovation he could at least have turned the coins over. But this is the point—that the camera man is deliberately lighting namely Lenin's portrait, on which the furious thug, having gone into a rage, is stamping his feet.

There is another place in this commentary that threw me into confusion. I quote: "But one must admit that there is a good deal that is familiar in the devices of our literary-social polemics: They remind us of methods used at the end of the 1960's when the state and the people were frightened by Tvardovskiy's NOVYY MIR; the state and the people were frightened! You see how global, how categorical the imperative, as the truth in the last instance, as a verdict! Yes, they frightened the state and the people. No more, no less..."

The idea is not new; it has been developing energetically for a long time whenever the discussion comes around to the 11 authors of a certain letter who allowed themselves to enter into polemics with the deputy editor-in-chief of NOVYY MIR, Aleksandr Dementyev. In a planned and widely publicized way our opponents are not only conducting a literary debate, but are persistently developing

an entire campaign to unmask reactionaries and criminals, all the time using such epithets as "stranglers" and "pogrom organizers." There are also epithets that are more terrible, as from the mouth of Byshinskiy—"murderers." As you can see, all this is far from being a joke.

But, in my view, there is nothing more fruitless than attempts to project various facts, selectively taken out of their historical context, on today's screen of public attention to the past—the picture is distorted in an ugly way. For the dictatorship of vulgar socialism has raged in our lives for a long time, like something generated by Stalin's spirit. In certain artificially exaggerated contradictions we have encountered exceptional people to whom it seemed that God Himself had chosen them to be eternal friends. Let us recall how harshly Simonov and Tvardovskiy judged Boris Pasternak after his novel "Dr. Zhivago" came out abroad. And all this was published in NOVYY MIR which, in the opinion of our opponents, has never been mistaken in anything. So are we damning Tvardovskiy, are we damning Simonov? But the person who, in response to this question, decides to cast a stone at the head of either one of them, while freely breathing today's air and feeling quite comfortable in it, risks, in our opinion, showing his own malicious hindsight and nothing more. And my opponents will probably agree with this. But why do they always become riled whenever the discussion turns to the "eleven," why the double standard?

Now let us turn our attention to another aspect of the matter. Was it a crime on the part of the MOLODAYA GVARDIYA authors and their editor Nikonov to publish articles that expressed serious alarm regarding the tragic destiny of our peasantry and the immense spiritual losses, since age-old moral and ethical norms had been violated among the people? Is it not now recognized by the entire society that this alarm was quite justified, and that it is to the honor and not to the dishonor of anyone who has expressed and does express it. We have finally begun to speak about the peasant-person, respectfully and at the top of our voices, participating passionately in his destiny. This is one of the remarkable accomplishments of the restructuring. So who began this discussion? The MOLODAYA GVARDIYA writers. Were their articles too scathing, bitter, or exaggerated? Yes, they were. And those of their opponents were equally so.

It is also true that these writers did not create the stagnation or preserve the existing policies. On the contrary, their rebellion frightened and irritated the creators of the stagnation. Do we recall who evoked the wrath of Suslov, about whom our opponents are increasingly speaking as they do of Zhdanov? Was it the MOLODAYA GVARDIYA writers or was it Aleksandr Dementyev with his article entitled "Traditions and Nationality," with his militant orthodoxy and with his collection of such accusations as a nonclass position, an ahistorical idea of good and evil, indulgence of petit bourgeois psychology which has not yet been completely eradicated from the peasantry?

Of course Suslov accepted Dementyev as a like-thinker. And the editor-in-chief of MOLODAYA GVARDIYA, Nikonov, was rudely and insultingly fired precisely for this reason. So why do our opponents so zealously attack those who argued with Dementyev regarding what he declared to be a merciless political accusation against the MOLODAYA GVARDIYA writers from the standpoint of the most savage vulgar socialism, which we now condemn so harshly and something generated by the Stalinist spirit?

Why are our opponents, essentially from the same Dementyev positions, waging an all-out war against the "eleven" and at the same time thinking that they are eradicating yesterday's evil? I shall put the question this way: Was there bitterness in the letter of the "eleven"? Yes, there was, but in reaction to the bitterness of Dementyev, and not only his. Taken in isolation, ripped out the atmosphere of the time, today it really does sound a little bit terrible. And our opponents are skillfully taking advantage of this. But is this honest? It is quite doubtful. So let us take a look at these things taking the historical context into account, let us carefully unwind the knots in the light of the magic lantern of dialectics, and not cut them with the cold blade of dead metaphysical thought.

And another question: Why do our opponents not want to recall the role Solzhenitsyn played in the Tvardovskiy drama? We know, admittedly, how deeply Aleksandr Trifonovich, who dreamed of the high wave of purges, believed in this exceptional person with his dramatic destiny. And it is not surprising that he published his story "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich." He selflessly defended the author of the story and his position until it became clear to him that the passionate hopes he placed in Solzhenitsyn were not to be realized. Solzhenitsyn liked more and more the role of an open opponent of the Soviets, and Tvardovskiy became incensed when there, abroad, they wanted to see him in such a role as well. No, he did not wish for this dubious glory, he wanted the main thing—for the Soviets to be Soviets.

And one more question. Are we speaking only about the "eleven"? After all, before declaring a war on them, we should think about what and who were behind them. Let us say, behind Vladimir Chivilikhin. He was one of the "eleven." So many people have read his book "Memory"! Incidentally, I am in favor of this memory and not the one represented in the Pamyat society by people I do not understand.

Has the commentator thought about the fact that by supporting those who defame the "eleven" he is contributing to the appearance of a dangerous split in our society, which can by no means be allowed? He, an ideologist, should be thinking about this day and night. And God forbid that his commentary be taken as a directive—it would be difficult to think of a larger ideological mistake on a strategic level. And I very

sincerely request that my comrades who are responsible for ideology not allow anything of the kind, for a society must be cemented together and not split apart. And this cement does exist. For we are unified in the main thing—in our support of the leaders of our party and government who are in charge of the restructuring. And if we do not always understand its goals the same way, then let us argue in keeping with all the rules of honor, steering clear of the old disease of bitterness.

And the last question—do I consider myself infallible?

No, I do not. I admit that in one specific case I was to blame. At a meeting of historians and writers I incorrectly commented upon an article by V. Kardin, "Legends and Facts," being guided by my old ideas about it. Having reread the article, I understood how unjust my accusations of Kardin were, when I said that he had somehow distorted the essence of the legend about the historical firing on the cruiser Aurora and belittled the victory of the Panfilov men. On the contrary, Kardin emphasized the revolutionary and human essence of the legend of the firing on the Aurora and demonstrated the immense significance of the fact on which it is based. The same thing can be said about his view of the feat of the Panfilov men. He, a veteran frontline soldier, is well aware of how great and tragic was the feat he was discussing. I deeply beg the pardon of Emil Vladimirovich Kardin. You see, I too was infected by the disease of identification. I must be cured.

Speaking of the need to be cured, I should like to hope that my opponents are also thinking about this and I ask that they take these words of mine as an invitation to common sense.

I shall not deny that I am sad to think about how much my speech can be misinterpreted, especially by those who will judge it from rumors. But I very much hope that the transcription of my speech will be read by responsible comrades and they understand what is bothering me, and not only me.

[Passage omitted]

The floor is turned over to V. Lichutin.

First I shall speak of two statements that impressed me. The statement of Yuvan Shestakov—the offended one. I agree with a good deal of it but he was shaking his fist in the wrong direction. There is a grain of truth in this statement.

The second statement is that of Yuriy Rytkeu. He constructed his speech so strangely, picked out what seemed to be minor facts, and grouped them in such a way that they look very odious, and from his statement the Russian people seem like some kind of vampires who invade other people's inherited lands and trample them down.



There is a bitter intrigue going on between a certain political school that has been created in the society and the future of the state. This political school includes all nations. And this school is an ancient offshoot of a legalized state Russophobia, which also existed in the doctrine of state politics in 1930. Although some people try to present Stalin as an anti-Semite, this was Stalin's doctrine, a doctrine of clearly expressed Russophobia, which began as early as in the first theses of Trotskiy, which suggested that the Russian people be herded into a camp. And when at the conclusion of the Brest Peace Lenin advised in favor of peace, Trotskiy advised against it. He said: let the Germans get as far as the Volga; it is not much to ask for a million or two people to be killed if the world opens its eyes and declares a battle against the Germans. Even then one could see that he was a louse. And after this follows a clear manifestation of Russophobia.

We have a much used term that is attractive on the outside, that is, all peoples are brothers, that is, all 15 republics are brothers. In the term itself I see an inherent evil because when brothers leave home they follow different paths.

They proceed not as a continuation of their family ties but as a continuation of their ancestry, the end of which lies on the distant path, in the distant future. So if you say that we are all brothers, the disease is already inherent in this. You know that Russia has always been called mother. The mother of nations, mother-land. And if we take Russia as mother as a postulate, then everything immediately becomes clear. And if it is good for the mother and bad for the brothers—this means that there is chauvinism in Russia. If it is bad for the mother and better for the sons than for the mother—this means that there is Russophobia in the country. As you can imagine, for now things are worse for Russia as mother than they are for the sons.

We have lost common sense. Common sense and expediency. As soon as common sense and expediency return, as soon, for example, as a peasant yard is arranged like a merchant's estate, as soon as we return this feeling to the state, you will see that everything will change immediately, as if through inspiration, of its own accord. But another question immediately arises here. How can common sense be returned to us? And when you begin to think you understand that common sense was completely lost not under Stalin, under the tyrant who suppressed our will, and so forth, but our common sense, our state common sense began to be fully lost under Khrushchev. Why?

Because gradually politicians as sources of ideological inspiration and leaders of the state began to lose their influence and their authority, which is why scholars gradually came into power, even if it was not so openly. It is this upper echelon, not the high echelon that is to blame for our current condition, but the upper echelon that stands even above the bureaucracy. Why? Because

the upper echelon was occupied by people who replaced the layer of forfeited Russian culture with a broad sweep that included also the culture of the people of the millennium. These were people of the first or second stratum of the intelligentsia who did not have the rudiments of a national ethic. I would call them absurdists. Both Zaslavskaya and Aganbegyan, I would say, are from the breed of absurdists, that is, they try to make everything absurd. I do not wish to say that this is deliberate absurdity.

Spare me your attempt to try to catch me up on this idea. I think that this takes place because of their lack of culture. Because only people without any national ethic can escape from one absurdity and push the nation into another one each time.

And this upper stratum which has actually replaced the politicians do not have enough of a sense of national ethic as a philosophical subject or a national property, which was practically destroyed in us and which we cannot recall. Because two properties should dictate the state structure—these are conscience and the national ethic. And both of these mechanisms are lacking.

And now I wish to return again and say a couple of words about Russophobia—this purely religious trend which originated during the time of the conquest of territories or, rather, during the times when the nations were being formed as states. Russophobia had a purely foreign cast. For example, the Roman Catholics hated the Russians because of their orthodoxy. Then Peter I introduced Russophobia within the nation; then when the internal agitation and the internal explosions began, Russophobia always arose. This was the case in 1905 and from 1917 through 1922. In practice, certain elements of it have not died out even yet. And any hostility, any attack, or landslide which has now been swallowed up by the press bears within it a shading of Russophobia. And LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA, which published an article from KOMMUNIST unwittingly fell under this influence. The disease is silently slipping into the schism, it has many faces, many shadings. Its favorite is that Russia is a dirty, lousy, greasy, lazy, drunken, spit-upon country. This is a common term that has made its way through all the world press, including Soviet (NOVOYE VREMYA, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, OGONEK, ZNAMYA, and so forth).

This quarrel is taking place not because somebody has offended somebody. For example, Korotich offended NASH SOVREMENNİK. No. The problem, the hostility stems from the fact that people are spitting on Russia. And our only request is: "For God's sake, do not spit on us, leave us our ideals and our behests. Do not push our apostles out of the ship! What kind of joy is there in spitting on Pushkin, Lermontov and other still living apostles like Sholokhov. These are our ideological apostles, these are our gods, let us bow down to them!"



In NASH SOVREMENNİK, MOLODAYA GVAR-DIYA or MOSKVA there was not a single bit of ranting about the Jewish people or about any of the 15 republics because this destructive feeling does not spark in the mind of the Russian person, this feeling of revenge and envy regarding other peoples, this simply does not exist in the soul of the Russian person!

I find it strange that this note from KOMMUNIST that appeared in LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA was signed by the editor-in-chief and the editorial board. If the editor-in-chief is a self-respecting Soviet writer, he should have taken two steps after this act: he should have either created his own newspaper and expressed his opinion in it or he should have immediately called the first secretary of the union and the chairman of the union and said: "I am leaving your mangy little newspaper because all of your little ideas, your profascist, chauvinist, and so forth little ideas are repulsive to me." I suggest bringing it up for a vote without waiting for another day: can such an editor be in charge of our only Russian newspaper?

[Passage omitted]

The floor was turned over to M. Kolosov.

From time to time our newspaper is subjected to mass attacks. During the past 2 years there has not been a single week when the attacks have died down completely. Two years during which certain extremists have threatened to drive out the newspaper, the editors, and so forth. Why is this? Our weekly does not support extreme positions—neither left nor right. It does not participate in internecine squabbles. It strives to arrange its work on principles of consolidation of writers' forces. It does not publish articles that would serve as inflammatory material for the current "literary" battles. For LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA there are no authors that are "ours" and "not ours"; we write mostly about the problems of the peoples of Russia. We did not invent this position. It is a party requirement. M. S. Gorbachev has discussed this repeatedly with mass media leaders. In brief, I think and the editors think that the newspaper holds a correct party position. It does not rush to either the left or the right. And this is precisely what does not suit certain extremists.

Of course I am far from thinking that everything is ideal in the editorial office itself or on the pages of the newspaper. Like everyone, we are learning about democracy and glasnost. We have many shortcomings. The collective is aiming at raising the level of the published materials and is actively working on this. According to numerous responses, the newspaper has undoubtedly become different recently—better, sharper, deeper, broader, more readable. It goes without saying that to some people everything will seem quite the opposite. What is good to one person is bad to another. But still there is such a thing as objective reality. If a thing is judged without prejudice this objective reality can be

seen. They say people do not chop down a dead fig tree. They chop down the one that is bearing fruit. It would be possible to be consoled by this proverb if things were not so serious. Up to this point the complaints against the newspaper and the slights have come from group positions. Now all this is becoming political in nature. Our understanding and attitude toward restructuring is increasingly diverging from the opinions expressed by our opponents. I have in mind first of all the reproaches about reprinting the article from KOMMUNIST. We are not speaking about whether or not to publish articles from the Ryazan secretariat. Perhaps it would be good to publish the entire transcription of the secretariat minutes. Let the readers know who is saying what. It is a pity that there is not enough room in the newspaper.

We are speaking about the fact that when publishing any material the newspaper must express its attitude toward it. We have not done this. The journal has corrected us. We agreed with this remark, the more so since there were extreme positions in certain statements of the Ryazan secretariat. We consider the journal's reproach against our editors because we did not express our position, we somehow concealed it, to be correct. But because we reprinted this article from the party journal we are immediately placed in the ranks of the anti-Russians. Strange! But the practice of reprinting is not an evil practice. PRAVDA's editorial about N. Andreyeva's article was reprinted by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, and not only by it. The article in KOMMUNIST was also an editorial.

Incidentally, we are often reproached about not arguing with other publications. This is wrong! Anyone who reads our newspaper can see that we do argue with other publications if there is a reason to do so, if there is a subject for argument.

But this is not enough for certain quarrelsome chaps, and they want to see a newspaper that is quarrelsome, trouble-making, taking extreme positions, that whitewashes some and defames others, and washes its dirty linen in public. We avoid this as much as we can.

And another aspect.

Yesterday after Sidorov's speech one of the leaders of our union called me aside and began to insist that I submit my application for retirement and go on a pension. "You heard that speech! Did you hear the reaction in the hall?! If you do not submit your notice today, tomorrow will be too late, they will confuse you with..."—and he named that substance with which they would confuse me. "Why do you need this? Get out while you are still ahead." It would seem that somebody has already started the work of mud slinging. These are their morals—these humanitarians of ours who profess goodness and kindness.

Incidentally, the discussion about my leaving has been going on for a long time. I was about to agree to it, but having thought about it for a while, I decided not to do this voluntarily right now. If the whole thing had to do with just me, the discussion would have been brief. But what can we do with a collective of editors who have believed in the restructuring, who are doing a great deal and already have done much? The people have rallied around the restructuring and they are offended that their efforts have gone unnoticed. And what about the writers? Many writers support the position of the newspaper, in which you will not find a single article that degrades or slings mud at any writer of any "camp." There is no such thing and never has been.

And the main thing—since the complaints are becoming political in nature—is that here begins a disturbance of my party conscience, which I do not intend to change.

[Passage omitted]

The floor was turned over to V. Belov.

There are so many emotions that it is even becoming terrifying. I should like to discuss just one thing—our weekly. With all my respect for Mikhail Makarovich, in his position I would still submit my resignation. There is no point in this kind of obstinacy and stubbornness.

If one is to speak about the newspaper, it is not a bad newspaper; it is just like NEDELYA or any other organ. The newspaper does not reflect the interests of the Russian writers and it does not reflect the interests of the national districts or the national areas of literature. It is for no reason here that Yuvan Shestalov says that the newspaper is excellent. Of course, the editor-in-chief will not say that it is bad. I do not think that such a thing has ever happened.

I do not subscribe to KOMMUNIST although I am a member of the CPSU. Our newspaper familiarized me with the party press. They have gotten rid of the din of all Western "voices" for now there are more of them than there are voices of our own. Turn the dial of your radio and you will hear how many people are bursting forth in Russian. How do they educate me? And my daughter, and everyone else?

There is the radio station "Freedom." The Voice of "Freedom." It tells of our Ryazan secretariat at which I, unfortunately, was not present, but I fully support the decisions of the secretariat and their spirit.

The Voice of "Freedom" speaks about the secretariat and about Valentin Grigoryevich Rasputin in almost the same voice as the one used by KOMMUNIST in that anonymous article. The opinions of our literary commentator in KOMMUNIST have converged with the opinion of Sergey Davlatov, an emigrant, and so forth.

I am surprised at such a strange similarity and I think that this was a mistake on the part of the editors. But that is not the question. I am speaking about the fact that the editorial staff simply must be renewed and the weekly must be inspired by new forces and the corresponding spirit of the times.

I suggest simply voting on the editor of the weekly, and everything will immediately become clear.

I. Filonenko took the floor to make a remark. I as a commentator am very sorry that so little has been said about commentary as such during the past 2 days.

I wish to make a remark regarding this. I wish to defend the good name not of a writer but of a scholar—Tatyana Ivanovna Zaslavskaya.

I object to the accusation that Zaslavskaya was the mother and perpetrator of the collective settlement of unpromising villages—this is the way Anatoliy Salutskiy put it in his report. True, he said that he does not know the father, but I know the father and I appeal to those present and call them as witnesses—Ivan Vasilyev, Leonid Ivanov, Vladimir Sitnikov, and Anatoliy Yemelyanov, who remember well because they themselves participated in the discussion in 1974 in the journal SELSKAYA NOV against declaring villages unpromising and collectively settling them. I carried on this discussion for an entire year. Therefore you yourselves understand that I was and still am well aware of the situation and who behaved how regarding this subject, and how Zaslavskaya behaved in this situation I know quite well because twice in that same year of 1974 scientific conferences were convened on her initiative: one in Novosibirsk and another in Tselinograd. I have kept the entire archive of that year and shall read it to you because there was a very serious discussion, and I shall read one sentence from the statement at the conference in Tselinograd and you will see the sharp contradiction between this and the quotes given by Salutskiy.

Here at one conference she said: "By calling a village unpromising we cause increased migration of the rural population to the cities. And this outflow is the stronger the more resolutely we begin to consolidate and resettle." This is the kind of alarm that was expressed. Tatyana Ivanovna Zaslavskaya at the time was working in Siberia and she said that every Siberian village is an advanced post in the assimilation of the territory of Siberia, and to touch any village in Siberia—at the time she had worked only in Siberia—to touch any village was a crime against the history of the Russian people. This is what Zaslavskaya said, instead of proposing such a thing.

I have not discussed the "father" of this idea. But the "father"—and I can document this at any time—I shall give precisely his given name, patronymic, and surname: Kobelevich, Bogdan Petrovich—the chief of the administration of planning and building up of rural population

points of Gosgrazhdanstroy, which is under the jurisdiction of the USSR Gosstroy. And the substantiation was given to him only with the agreement of the Ministry of Public Health which was closing its little hospitals in the villages, and the Ministry of Education immediately closed its little schools in the villages, and the Gosstroy did not require any substantiation from Zaslavskaya at the time.

With this the debate was ended. The closing word was given by S. Mikhalkov.

The debates have ended but the passions have not died down. You are gripped by complicated feelings when you think about the statements of the participants in the plenum. But still one feeling prevails—this is pain and alarm about the situation not only in our native Russian republic, but also throughout the country. It would be extremely important for the mass media to convey our thoughts to the broad reading public in their entirety, without summarizing, without cutting, and without abridging them.

There is such a possibility as central television. Why should we not organize such keen discussions as have taken place here at the plenum through central television? Are they really any less important than the excessive abundance of programs we see today: "The Fifth Wheel," "View," and so forth and so on?

In addition, writers spoke here. The writers are the voice of the people, and our government should hear this voice of the people. We are raising here global issues of state significance, political significance, economic significance, and these issues are being raised by competent people. Such as Antonov, whom the Moscow organization should undoubtedly accept for membership in the union. We have given autonomous authority to the Moscow organization so let the Moscow organization wield its authority reasonably, and one of the reasonable steps would be for the Moscow secretariat of the Union of Writers to give a union card to Antonov. If they do not do it, we shall do it by our own authority. After all, at one time even Yefremov was invited to join the Writers Union—that remarkable archaeologist and traveler who did not even submit an application to the Writers Union. He was invited and was told: "You have been accepted into the Writers Union"—and he justified this.

Various evaluations of the plenum could be heard in the speeches. My opinion is that there was a large discussion about commentary as a militant genre of literature. Life itself and the revolutionary changes in the society have brought forth this genre, a militant and aggressive kind of literature. This was discussed very thoroughly, objectively, and convincingly. It is gratifying that against the general background of speeches one can single out the voice of our Russian writers. A typical feature of them is their keen sense of responsibility for the fate of the restructuring and a desire to help the party to solve the urgent problems of socioeconomic development. The

best publications of our writers continue the glorious traditions of Russian literature. They are a long way from sensationalism and whitewashing of the negative sides of our life, and regardless of how difficult and contradictory the problems raised in their works may be, they all inspire hope and optimism that the cause of restructuring will triumph.

But still I should like to say that, unfortunately, at our plenum where we raise such important issues and in the presidium we do not see responsible officials of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers, and yet the questions we have raised today pertain directly to them.

S. Mikhalkov went on to tell the participants in the plenum about the concrete steps that had been taken by the secretariat of the RSFSR Writers Union for following the orders and suggestions of the writers and the difficulties they have had to overcome along the way.

Many problems of the discussion we have held here, S. Mikhalkov continued, we have included in the plenum's resolution which we have adopted. We are trying to keep track of its implementation.

Some very interesting ideas have been expressed in this hall and at the plenum. The writers have brought to this plenum the ideas, concerns, and experiences of their people, the people who are sometimes very removed from our literary discussions. I liked the speech by Buylov, a terrifying speech. He was right in many ways.

The people are indeed removed from our literary discussions, but still they are actively working and thinking about how to overcome the crisis in our economy.

Certain academicians were also mentioned here. I am not a great specialist in this area, and I think that Salutskiy knows it much better. Perhaps really on behalf of the writers who understand the economy and on behalf of the commentators one can hint or state directly somewhere that which different academicians advise. Or perhaps one should expand the range of these academicians.

I should like to say a couple more words. I really liked Salutskiy's speech. It took not 2 weeks or even 2 or 3 months to write this speech. He worked on it for 7 months. We assigned it to him and he did it responsibly.

In the complicated period of glasnost the importance of the press has increased. People are thirsty for the truth that is coming from the pages of the journals and newspapers. How great the writer's responsibility for his words! Democracy, glasnost, pluralism of opinions. But the problem is that this pluralism is not completely reflected in our journals and newspapers. Certain press agencies understand democracy incorrectly, they understand it as only a one-sided movement: they publish only materials of people who think as they do and reject those

with which they do not agree. We all must learn democracy and the art of discussion, and have a respectful attitude toward others' opinions. Commentary is an important literary genre, but still the main calling of the writer is the artistic work. The people are expecting us to produce outstanding creations concerning our turbulent times, our people, and our revolutionary period. We must always remember this.

#### From the Editors:

The alarm and concern, the pain and anger, which could be heard in the speeches of many of the speakers evokes the deepest sympathy from all honorable Soviet people, all patriots of our multinational fatherland.

The impoverished situation of the country's breadwinner, the peasant, who does not enjoy the modern conveniences and material support of the poorest city dwellers, who is severed from the foundations of real culture; the low level of education acquired in the rural schools, which creates unequal conditions for the further occupational and cultural growth of rural youth; the continuing outflow of rural population to the cities, which causes negative consequences not only in the economic, but also in the social-moral sphere; the neglect of spiritual experience and the most valuable cultural and ethical traditions of their ancestors; the criminal indifference to monuments of domestic history; remnants of the vulgar sociological approach to literature, art, and folklore; distortion of Leninist principles of international relations and true friendship of peoples, which has led to manifestations of nationalism, chauvinism, and Russophobia—all this as well as cases of violation of democratic norms of life, the "costs" of pluralism, group egoism, and a noncritical attitude toward phenomena of mass culture was discussed in a frank, spirited, and pointed way at the plenum.

And this candor, sincerity, and openness of positions, viewpoints, and judgments, in our opinion, are gratifying signs of the restructuring.

At the same time it seems to us that certain speakers themselves were unable to get rid of the shortcomings for which they reproached their opponents: excessive aggressiveness, one-sidedness, and being excessively categorical and intolerant of people who think differently.

For now it is clear to everyone that the roots of many and perhaps all of our difficulties today, our problems and our tragedies go back to the years of Stalinism, which created the heartless command-administrative system, and Brezhnevism, which one of the speakers at the plenum suggested frankly calling the period of stagnation. It is these deformations of socialism that are the common causes of the economic crisis, social injustice, and attempts to classify a natural desire for national self-determination and the development of national traditions, language, and literature as bourgeois nationalism and Russophobia, which is just as insulting to the Russian people as it is to any other fraternal people. Why look for different roots and different guilty parties?

Is it not obvious that such searches can lead only to blind alleys of confrontation and hostility? Does the tragic experience of Karabakh and the complicated and contradictory development of social processes in the Baltic area not arm us with an awareness of the only constructive path, an understanding that common problems can be overcome only by common efforts and not by mutual reproaches? Did the catastrophic disaster experienced in Armenia not demonstrate again the truly inexhaustible potential of compassion and mercy, sensitivity and responsiveness, and the ability to feel another's pain as one's own?! But yet it is not only destroyed houses, enterprises, and schools, not only tens of thousands of lost lives that can awaken us to what keeps man alive and great!...

We have decided not to reproduce certain of the ideas and judgments not only because we do not agree with them: after all, disagreement and truth do not always coincide. But we are convinced that certain statements, even if they are sincere and honest, but excessively quick-tempered, under today's circumstances cannot contribute to arranging constructive dialogue or a gradual, albeit difficult, but necessary coming together of the various points of view. We understand that not everyone will agree with us. But our time is a time of responsibility. And we do not turn away from it.

**Moldavian Official Discusses Local 'Mafias'**  
*18000445 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA*  
*in Russian 15 Jan 89 p 4*

[Article by Moldavian SSR Procurator N. Demidenko:  
"Do We Have a Mafia?"]

[Text] What is organized crime? How is it manifested? Does it exist in our republic? These or similar questions are more and more often being asked in letters from citizens, at press-conferences, in the pages of the press, and in speeches at meetings and on radio and television. Even the weekly LITERATURA SHI ARTA has published an appeal on this topic on behalf of writer V. Mikhail, "Mafiya yn Moldova."

The magazine SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA ZAKON-NOST [Socialist Legality] No 6-1988 gave space to a letter from N. Nikolayev which, analyzing the state of affairs with respect to crime in the country, lists Moldavia among the centers of organized crime. Prior to this, the opinions of certain investigators of the USSR Procuracy were published on the pages of LITERTURNAYA GAZETA and OGONEK, which directly or indirectly confirmed the presence of organized crime in our republic as well. Unfortunately, not one of the specialists who spoke out on this topic cited concrete examples in confirmation, nor did they pose any sort of arguments. We are left with no firm basis for such conclusions, and there is a danger that this was done more on the basis of hearsay than as the result of in-depth investigations and arguments.

Of course, having said that, it does not at all signify that we do not notice any negative changes in the structure and dynamics of crime, nor that we are trying to shut ourselves off from such a dangerous phenomenon as organized crime threatens to become.

In connection with the aforementioned publications, the republic Procuracy and the MVD have been analyzing a great deal of statistical material on the state and the dynamics of common, group, and recidivist crime and its character. Criminal cases have been studied on theft on an especially grand scale, on account-padding, bribe-taking and other crimes of avarice committed by organized groups, occurring in a more-or-less widespread sphere, and having a systematic character.

According to methodological recommendations from scientists, crime by organized groups (in other words, organized crime) possess the following mandatory attributes (I will cite them in a somewhat simplified manner): premeditation, or planned criminal actions; relative stability of criminal associations among the members of a group, and distribution of roles among them; a kind of cooperation and specialization of criminal groupings and their members; systematic study and utilization of social and other conditions to which the criminal acts have adapted; the presence of specific norms and rules of behavior and interrelations, and a

hierarchy and subordination among members of the groups; carrying out measures to guard against exposure and punishment, taking into consideration the changing forms of action of the law-enforcement institutions of the state and society, in connection with which dishonest law-enforcement officials and responsible officials are quite often recruited.

At the same time, to reiterate, the belief is accepted that all six of the attributes mentioned are necessarily inherent in organized crime. Therefore, when studying the crime situation in our republic, we tried at the same time to single out these characteristic attributes. As a result of the work carried out, we came to the conclusion that such an approach is proper only for defining organized crime as a social phenomenon, with the entire aggregate of multi-faceted forms of manifestation.

Judging from information available to us on the state and the nature of crime in the country, one must admit that organized crime takes place, as they say. The extent to which it has managed to affect society, to take root and mature, is another matter. In different regions, manifestations of crime have their peculiar features. In some, corruption has become widespread; in others it is not on such a scale, or conditions have not been as favorable for the infection to spread.

But if one takes each individual organized group or the chain of crimes it has committed, one cannot always find all these attributes, much less single them out in their pure form.

Study of materials from criminal cases on group crime committed in Moldavia in recent years has shown that hardly a single one of them, taken in isolation, can unambiguously be considered the "criterion" of organized crime. With respect to the criminal case of Vyshku and his accomplices, convicted of bribe-taking (This case, from our viewpoint, is taken by some people as an example of organized crime), cooperation was not established; social conditions were not studied; nor were specific rules of interrelationships worked out. Preparatory measures for protection against possible punishment were not worked out; and criminal contacts with officials of law-enforcement organs or evidence of bribing them were not established. Study of criminal cases on robbery and theft of citizens' personal property in which certain militia officials also took part, have shown that the groups acted without clear-cut definition of roles, contacts with other groups, or well-thought-out plans to guard against exposure.

However, one can hardly come to reassuring conclusions about this. Materials on criminal cases in aggregate and reports from officials of militia and corrective labor institutions testify to the fact that there are people who consider themselves professional criminals, with "criminal rights," and "authorities." The criminal influence of recidivists has intensified: both in the corrective labor institutions and at liberty, they are winning over



new accomplices. Stable criminal groups which have been operated for an extended period of time, committing dozens and even hundreds of crimes, have been exposed on the territory of the republic and in neighboring oblasts of the Ukraine. Attempts are also noted to influence and put pressure on law-enforcement organs to release the criminals from liability; however, such actions are hard to catch and are usually written off to blunders in the investigation.

There is a need to supplement these questions with certain information on crime in the republic, which is assuming an increasingly threatening nature. According to preliminary data, the number of crimes registered over the past year increased by 56 percent in comparison with 1987. Not one other union republic has had such an increase in the crime rate. Crimes not in the serious category account for the overall increase, but the number of serious crimes has increased significantly as well. Over an 11-month period (information for the year is still being tallied), 185 premeditated murders and attempted murders were registered; there were almost 400 instances of causing severe bodily harm to people; and there were up to 300 rapes. All the acts of vandalism and the cruel and inhuman attitude of the criminals toward their victims is very disturbing. Theft of personal property, especially from apartments, has literally become a calamity. Instances of robbery and assaults with the intent of forcefully taking property have become more frequent. Hats are being snatched, jeans and running shoes are being stripped off, purses are snatched, and money and other valuables are being taken from passers-by, even from children. Moreover one cannot help noticing that for the most part these crimes are committed by young people, in connection with which, overcoming the destructive and illegal actions on the part of the up-coming generation makes educational and preventive work increasingly important.

Things are especially bad in our capital. On holidays and non-work days the number of criminal assaults increases noticeably. The thought occurs more and more often—Is this not connected with the influx of the motley crowds to the notorious sanctioned and non-sanctioned meetings and gatherings, at which one frequently hears appeals for disobedience to the authorities, where the seeds of distrust and enmity are sown, and where emotions and ambitions are held up? Do these forces not back up the criminals, who stand to gain from an incandescent atmosphere?

The fact that uncontrolled "meeting democracy" destabilizes the situation and can lead to unforeseen consequences has been frequently pointed out to the organizers of such mass measures; however, it would appear that not all of them have yet realized the responsibility which they assume in inflaming passions. Hints of the possibility of a Moldavian variant of the events in Nagornyy Karabakh, blowing up minor domestic quarrels and

conflicts to the scale of national and language problems, and arousal of general suspicion with respect to the leading cadres, are monstrosly cynical.

Occasionally attempts are made to explain the outburst of crime by the predominance of newcomers and immigrants. We have never tried to single out criminals in terms of national or language attributes. A criminal is a criminal, and he must answer according to the law, in spite of such differences. But since the questions were raised, we took the first 500 cases which took place and tallied up the contribution, if one can put it that way, of representatives of various nationalities. The results showed that the proportions of criminals just about matches with the proportion of the national make-up of the republic's population.

Taking these facts into consideration, one could come to the conclusion that there are manifestations of organized crime in the republic, and that they represent a serious danger to society because of the possibility that they might develop, spread further and be reproduced in other areas. Moreover, there are favorable conditions for that, connected with the stratification of people, the increasingly severe clashes of group interests, the growth of legal nihilism and dislocations in the system for distributing material resources, and society's imperfect mechanism for preventive influence on persons having a tendency for illegal acts. The fact that the law-enforcement organs have also turned out to be largely unprepared for such negative changes in the crime situation and have to operate largely by means of trial and error also has its effect. And the state of our scientific-technical equipment often is unable to keep pace with the "enterprise" of the criminal elements.

The necessity for working out measures to oppose organized crime is obvious. There is nothing to fear in playing it safe on this question.

In this connection I would like to stress that in order to wage a successful struggle with organized crime, it is very important to expose and eliminate organized criminal groups as soon as they begin to operate. Therefore, I think that both the law and investigative and judicial practice should focus attention on the attributes of group crime, in order to prevent them from growing into organized crime groups. These are above all the stability of criminal ties among members of groups, and the premeditated, previously planned and well-thought out nature of their criminal activities.

On this account, we believe it would be sensible to establish in the law increased criminal liability for premeditated crime and for criminal groups which consistently operate together.

In this complex operational situation the prosecutorial, internal affairs, justice and court authorities are focusing their efforts on curbing the unbridled crime wave, with the help of party and soviet organizations, and society.

Unfortunately we cannot yet boast of any great successes. Many crimes remain undisclosed, serious mistakes are made in investigatory work and in the administration of justice, and the public prosecutor's directorate is not very effective. But this is the subject of another conversation, which concerns primarily professional law-enforcement activity. I would just like to say that a great deal depends on public opinion and on the position of the populace. The creative intelligentsia could make a weighty contribution here to the moral regeneration of society.

**Pochivalov Calls for Reappraisal of Attitude Toward 'Emigre' Concept**

18000484 Moscow *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA*  
in Russian 28 Dec 88 p 14

[Article by Leonid Pochivalov: "Who Are They, These Emigres?"]

[Text]

**Letter to the Editor**

For many years, I have worked at a hotel in Leningrad. Many foreigners stay there. Our attitude toward all of them is the same—they are foreign guests. However, as soon as a "former [Soviet citizen]" stops there, you immediately feel this strange alarm, apprehension and at times hostility. Have we not created long-lasting intentional mistrust of our fellow countrymen abroad? Why do we know so little about them? Could we be passing this over in silence on purpose? Why?

[Signed] E. Korolyuk, Leningrad

**Emigres...** Many of my interlocutors to whom this term refers objected: not emigres at all! Some called themselves "migrants," others—"refugees," and the third group—"citizens of Russia abroad." They shied away from the notion "emigres": supposedly, it did not embrace many nuances of political, historical and moral nature, and there are a lot of such nuances in this Russia abroad!

I opened the Dal dictionary. This is how it was put 100 years ago: "Emigration—outmigration, settling away, resettling, moving abroad to a new motherland." This is precisely it! The first, the second and the third groups all fit in—Gen Denikin who lived out his life in France, Fedor Raskolnikov, the Soviet ambassador who opposed Stalin's tyranny, writer Viktor Nekrasov exiled from the motherland, and Jews, Armenians and Germans leaving for good in our times...

Emigre... I remember the alarmingly dangerous taste of this word, identical with "the enemy of the people" from the days of my childhood. Political cliches sunk in: "emigre scum," "the emigre lair," "these emigres!", with contempt on top of everything. Those who deserved this kind of attitude were quite numerous. However, not all emigres did. When the tiniest pieces of truth found their

way back to us after the war, it appeared inconceivable that our sworn enemy Denikin had collected funds for Red Army resisting the hitlerites, and a nun, mother Mariya, a princess of noble birth, had preferred to go to her death rather than accept pardon from the fascists, the enemies of her Motherland. Could this have happened for real?

The issue of emigration in our country dates back quite a while. They also left Russia under the tsars, especially the Ukraine and Belorussia, in pursuit of a happier lot across the seas and oceans. Quite a few left Russia—someone has always fled it: Prince Kurbskiy and the writer Gertsen, the Dukhobors and the Old Believers, members of the "People's Will" and Social Democrats. Our party was born over there, in emigration.

The October Revolution became the watershed which changed the meaning of the notion "emigration," previously not marked by special dramatism. The results of this historic cataclysm in terms of asserting and toppling, of conquests and losses, are multifaceted. Yes, there were losses, and considerable ones at that. The Civil War robbed Russia of those involved and educated—some were exterminated, others tossed out of the country as enemies. Many of those who did not understand and accept the revolution left themselves—university professors and engineers, military specialists and well-known literary figures, physicians and musicians. The new Russia which set out to catch up with the decrepit world of capitalism and leave it behind on all scores was losing tremendous intellectual potential.

Quite a few did not leave blinded by class hatred, most left out of fear. Unfair punishment and arbitrary rule in our country did not begin with Stalin, but before him. A. M. Gorkiy saved many lives by interceding on behalf of the intelligentsia during this rough time. Many were not spared: the death of the poet Gumilev brought to light the senselessness of the forces which reduced revolution to destruction alone. The execution of the Romanov family, including children, struck fear into the hearts and generated new refugees. Along with their excellencies, common people, peasants in soldier's coats, bound by the orders of officers, also fled. Later, I met them in Paris driving taxicabs and in Hong Kong working as cloak-room attendants in restaurants. Once I met a very old man, Sychev, in Australia, in the hot city of Darwin. During the Civil War, he was a colonel's orderly, and shined his master's boots. He fled with him. A semi-literate man, he worked as a garbage collector until his old age. He missed his Volga. He was "fearful" of going back—because of his master's boots.

My God, it was a bitter task to explain yourself and lie in order to justify arbitrariness to poor souls such as the old man Sychev!

Losing their Motherland became a tragedy for many. They tried to emulate what was lost with naive and pitiful fanaticism under the roofs of Harbin and Melbourne, San Francisco and Paris. I have seen a lot

written on the signs of restaurants, clubs and shops in these lands that takes you back to "the shores of the distant Motherland"—"Volga," "Russia," "Batkivshchina," "Troyka," "Matreshka," "Rushnik," "Ei, Ukhnem," "Ochi Chernye..." "Their own" journals and newspapers began to be published, "their own" publishing houses, schools, colleges, old-age homes and even theater companies appeared...

Russians abroad had difficulties integrating themselves into a way of life alien to them. In smoke-filled restaurants, the emigre Leshchenko tore apart his own and their souls: "Here, under the alien sky, I am like an unwanted guest"... Russia continued to exist in the books, songs, pictures and movies created by Russians beyond its boundaries. This has always been the case—from Ivan Bunin to Andrey Tarkovskiy, from Svyatoslav Rerikh to Mikhail Shemyakin.

Patriotism is not compatible with fear and mistrust. Bunin, Shalyapin, Rakhmaninov, Pavlova, Rerikh, Nabokov and Sikorskiy did not bring themselves up to returning to the motherland... Kuprin, Al. Tolstoy, Vertinskiy, Gen Count Ignatyev, General Yakhontov ventured to return. They got lucky: they lived out their lives honorably. A different future awaited others, even those with big names. In 1939, Marina Tsvetayeva came back from France, and, persecuted, took her life in godforsaken Elabuga. This is to say nothing about the lesser known ones. How many of those who left Paris and Rome, New York and Toronto, Harbin and Adelaide, ended their lives behind barbed wire at Kolyma or in Central Asia? My aunt, who has done 10 years in a camp as a "political prisoner," told me that she had seen a princess from the Trubetskiye family die. Right before the war, she returned to the Motherland, and, for the right to be in the land of her ancestors, brought the family heirloom, an ancient Russian icon. Even the icon could not help the princess!

Thus, apprehensions about returning were fed not only by the vicious inventions of the bourgeois propaganda, as our propaganda claimed at the time.

In the far corner of the world, in the New Zealand city of Christchurch, I met a Hero of the Soviet Union... and a citizen of New Zealand. He was the commander of a torpedo boat. He sank a good number of fascist vessels. One day, however, the boat was hit by a shell, the commander was taken prisoner. He saw the horrors of a hitlerite concentration camp. He was liberated by the Americans. He did not bring himself up to returning. He knew that being taken prisoner would not be forgiven, especially to a Hero [of the Soviet Union]. At the time, nobody was forgiven for that.

Many thousands of such unfortunates, the so-called "displaced persons," dispersed by the cruel time of war through alien cities and villages, were anathemized in their Motherland. Most of them were honest people guilty of nothing before the Motherland—rather the

Motherland, or, more precisely, the regime which then ruled the Motherland, was guilty before them: it let happen the occupation of our land which the people did not expect; it allowed entire armies to be taken prisoner in the first months of the war due to the lack of experience or talent in the command; subsequently, after the war, the authorities pinned their own miscalculations on these very people, the ones who happened to be on the other side of the front through no fault of their own. In all honesty, we should be only grateful to the countries which have given what shelter they could to these thousands of new exiles, of our homeless, hungry and naked Soviet citizens. Instead, we feared "the displaced persons" more than erstwhile princes and generals, and kept our distance—traitors! Our former prisoner of war who found himself abroad could not even send a message to his own mother. Such messages would not arrive.

Once in Bangkok, the capital of Thailand—the country where a Russian emigre woman born in Kiev was queen at one time—I met her fellow countryman, also from Kiev and also an emigre. He begged me: "If you happen to be in Kiev... Here is the address... My mother is there... Tell her I am alive, alive!" Doing this "was not advisable," but I did it. I will forever remember the moment when I said the first words to the gray-haired hunched woman who came out to meet me.

But could all of them be trusted? What about the former Vlasov and Bandera men? I met them abroad, they also sought me out. I heard them out, and frequently I did not know what to answer. To go against your own people, arms in hand! Shoo them away! However, I could not. After all, there is a man in front of you, with his human pain. Former [fascist] policemen, volunteer head men, executioners from Sondercommandos with the blood on their hands still not washed off did not seek such meetings with fellow countrymen. They knew: there is no forgiving this! But there were others, by chance...

This is why there cannot be a wholesale [denunciation] of everyone without distinction. Vlasov threw his units together not only of butchers ready for their work. He sought soldiers among the Red Army personnel intimidated by being a prisoner of hitlerites who had no way out—"either.. or," among those who have suffered at the hands of the authorities during forcible collectivization, those whose relatives were subjected to repressions, exiled or executed. The stalinist regime which operated in the name of Soviet power itself bred foes among the people, who, unfortunately, saw their personal enemy and that of their family not in the regime which distorted the humane principles of Soviet power, but in the power itself. The hitlerite, and, after the war, Western propaganda exploited this skillfully.

At present, some people in the West try to argue that the Vlasov army was an army of anti-stalinists. This is nonsense. These were formations of traitors. However, there were those among them who had long sought an opportunity to go over to the Red Army, those who at the

end of the war tried to help our advancing troops in some manner in order to atone for their guilt before the motherland. They were not given credit for this. The Vlasov men who were taken prisoner by us were exiled, and the ones who were not turned into the same "displaced persons." They also look toward the motherland from across the seas and oceans: how is she doing now? Some look with hope. Is there any hope left for them?

Quite recently, the word "traitor" was bent to mean what the iron policy required. The frightening brand was placed on the name of an old bolshevik, Lenin's comrade-in-arms, who had the audacity to argue with the new leader; a writer who submitted the manuscript of a book which did not comply with "the spirit of the time" was accused of treason, as well as all or almost all "former ones" who ended up abroad. Now is the time to use this branding term with particular judiciousness, on the basis of principles of the genuine state of law which we are creating.

I believe that the legal reform, currently in preparation, should definitely take into account the issues of emigration as well—they are complex and even bitter for patriotic pride to swallow: what is so good about people leaving your country by the thousand! However, these problems exist and will continue to exist, they won't be ignored.

Take, for example, the issue of forcible exile. Which law provides for the forcible deprivation of a person of his Soviet citizenship? For what deeds? If they are criminal deeds, he should be tried for them. Other deeds? Which ones? Who decides this? How is the person to defend himself and before whom? It appears that this kind of coercion began with Trotsky whom Stalin hated. Even then this event stirred protests due to being illegal—a man was deprived of his motherland because he had his own opinion and defended it. This was many years ago, but then they reinstituted this practice, and relatively recently. Were such actions constitutional? People had no opportunity to defend themselves from arbitrary rule. If the Constitutional Court had existed in our country, they could have appealed to it, even concerning a decision of the Council of Ministers. Is the existence of such an illegal practice rightful at all in a truly democratic state which we want our Motherland to be?

Recently, in Moscow, at the board of the "Rodina" Society, which has quite a good idea about the the situation of our fellow countrymen abroad, the conversation turned to the legal aspect of our relationship with them. It is far from perfect. I thought: is this not the time for the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to pass a special law regulating this relationship? In this matter as well, the state of law should rest on legislation and justice.

Of course, there are indisputable paragraphs which concern treason. Some pay for their failure to return or flight by divulging state secrets and violating the military oath in the name of pecuniary interests. By disowning the

motherland, they intend to gain comfortable life "over there" at her expense. Our foes always have 30 pieces of silver at the ready. The diplomat Shevchenko, former Soviet representative at the UN, who paid for shelter in America by divulging state secrets will not "wash off" the shame. The pilot Belenko who hijacked the most up-to-date military plane to Japan in order to sell it there for the highest price possible will remain a criminal.

"The law is strict but it is the law." This is an old and just truth. However, the law itself should be just both in retribution and in clemency. There are quite a few who do not deserve retribution.

A friend of mine, the captain of a seagoing vessel, an excellent seaman, was relieved of his responsibilities. In Italy, a sailor jumped his ship. The man was an atrocious worker and a misfit. So, he ran away, and that's the end of it, so much the better for the crew. However, at the shipping line they saw it otherwise: supposedly, a traitor was harbored in their midst! So, the captain was punished for many years to come.

I am convinced that it makes no sense to consider everyone a traitor who wants to live in an alien rather than his own land. God be with him, let him live where he likes! He is condemning himself to a great woe—parting with the motherland. However, there are those who think otherwise, who consider the old principle of footloose wanderers "motherland is where your stomach is full" to be more acceptable. There was a time when it was almost impossible to leave the "bounds" for good. Even now the opportunity to do so is provided selectively. In view of that, there are attempts to flee, with some people going as far as committing a crime. There have been many successful and abortive attempts to hijack planes. Innocent people paid in blood and the Soviet Union—in prestige for the effort of a worthless person to flee God knows where.

I would like to believe that we will learn to look at all problems of this nature with wisdom, humanism, reserve, and dignity as is normal for a great socialist power which does not stoop to trifling matters in its policy. In recent decades, our motherland has lost many bright, talented individuals who were not treated intelligently, tactfully and with a feel for politics in their native land, partly because of prejudice and stupidity. Now we are backpedalling, and it is good. Alas, Andrey Tarkovskiy, Aleksandr Galich and Viktor Nekrasov were "returned home" posthumously, the same as Ivan Bunin in his time. We print I. Brodskiy, call on the outstanding economist V. Leontyev to cooperate, legalize a novel by V. Voynovich and poems by N. Korzhev in the pages of journals, talk about the books by A. Solzhenitsyn and opening an exhibition by M. Shemyakin, invite N. Makarova to participate in joint performances in London. Many other no less brilliant names of ours do not belong to us anymore—Baryshnikov, Nuriev, Rostropovich! It is distressing not to see and hear their art. They are not ours!

Emigration consists of many strata, and it is not united. It is torn by social, ethnic and religious contradictions. There are many of those who are intolerant of the system in our country, of everything that happens here, including the process of democratization. They do not want to talk about Soviet Russia at all. I have also met those who are completely intransigent. Once I almost fell victim to them. Zionists tried to place a bomb on board an Aeroflot plane. The watchfulness of the New York police saved us. This was 16 years ago. This year, a member of our delegation, an archbishop from Ivano-Frankovsk, was verbally abused in Chicago, in my presence, by his fellow countrymen—Uniates living in the USA: supposedly, he sold out to "the Moscow trash" ["moskali"]. Arguments between various religious communities, different waves and strata of emigres are still underway, but ultimately these arguments boil down to one thing—their attitude to the country of their birth. I still believe that a common ground with many of them may be found, even with the Uniates, if both parties give up their erstwhile bias and intolerance.

The third, current wave of emigration is termed economically motivated even in the Western press. Most of them have left and are leaving because "life across the sea is not hard." I do not believe I am entitled to pass judgment on them. Personally, I find the dubious truth that motherland is where your stomach is full to be disagreeable. There also is another, very old biblical piece of wisdom: "Not by bread alone." Some may take issue with me, though. "I have no intention to spend my one and only life standing in lines. I am better off standing here," a merry, talkative bartender, a former Muscovite, told me at the airport in Tel Aviv. I did not argue with him. Everyone searches in life for things of his own choosing.

Yet, many of these people, having achieved financial welfare abroad, did not cut themselves off from their recent past in a single stroke, as the umbilical cord of a child is cut off from the mother. "Do not think that we are people without kith or kin. My grandfathers are buried in Tashkent. This is why I sell merchandise to Russian sailors at one-quarter off," told me Semen, formerly from Tashkent, currently the owner of a small consumer goods shop in the Moroccan port of Tangier.

People like him will always meet me, a person arriving from "there," with attention: "How are things over there? In Moscow? In Odessa? In Zhytomir? In Vitebsk?" In New York, there is a street nicknamed "Yashkin Street," where the merchants are mostly Jews—arrivals from our country. I have been there a number of times, and have not encountered hostility once: they talked about my motherland without malice and with interest. Incidentally, I have heard owners of many such shops speak among themselves in Russian only as well, be it in New York, Tangier, Piraeus or Toronto. A special TV channel broadcasting in Russian only for thousands of Americans who have come from Russia exists in New York for a reason.

Quite a few Soviet Germans leave the USSR with the third wave. They are leaving the motherland where their ancestors of German extraction settled as early as under Catherine II not only due to economic considerations. Some of them stress that they suffered enough under Stalin—collective exile, persecution, and in the post-personality cult times their hopes were dashed by the lack of haste shown by the authorities in making the Germans equal to other peoples of our country not only in their civil rights but in the opportunity to use them.

The departure of Germans is also a loss for the motherland. Russian Germans have given the motherland a lot of outstanding talent, have invested tremendous labor into developing our society, and could still invest some. Instead, they are leaving, many of them—with pain...

The "third wave" does not come up the alien shores without difficulties. They did not come there to be taken care of—they went to a world of stiff competition where you have to fight hard for your place in the sun. Opening your own business, even a small one, means edging someone else out, most often a local native. Not everyone was meant to get the upper hand in this fight. Many turned out to be failures, "misfits."

In LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, I wrote about one of these people. He was dying to leave the USSR, came to the USA—and lost himself; his medical diploma was not recognized, and he did not discover in himself the ability to elbow others aside. He asked to be allowed to return. They satisfied his request. In the motherland, they provided work in his profession for him, and gave him an apartment. However, for me to mention this apartment in the article was the work of the devil. I received a lot of angry letters! People are on the waiting lists for 15 years, while this one has left and come back—and here it is for him, an apartment with all amenities! What has he really done to deserve it!?

The readers were right. Let them leave! Let them even ask to be allowed back in if they have not found their place "over there"—can you prevent those gone astray from knocking on your door again? However, they should be allowed back in on the most realistic basis. The charity of the state is great but not boundless. If you are responsible for your actions be responsible for their consequences. A sudden attack of home sickness is no big boon for the country you have left of your own free will. There should not be any expectation that the state will later have to underwrite your home sickness gratefully and completely.

The issue of returning is not a simple one. I felt this recently in San Francisco. Before me was an old couple with their eyes full of tears, they begged me: help us! They want to die in the motherland, in their native Belorussia. They have not been able to receive a visa. I raised their issue in our consulate. Certainly, fairness dictates that their request be granted. But where will they



return? Their native village has become an urban-type settlement, and there are no spare apartments there. Who will take care of these old people? There are no relatives.

There are quite a few people like these dreaming about finding their last shelter in the motherland. Could we create special boarding houses paid for by the residents themselves? After all, everybody has savings. Such boarding houses are in operation in Hungary. Charity is what is needed the most in all of these sad episodes. After all, the Union of Writers of the USSR has shown its kind caring by facilitating the return of the talented Russian writer I. V. Odoyevtseva from France after 65 years of emigration. I met her in the vicinity of Moscow at the writers' House of Creativity and appreciated how wisely we acted.

The unique phenomenon of Russian-language literature has long existed abroad. It began to emerge in the first post-revolutionary years in France and Germany. In West Berlin, I saw a program on the local TV. It turns out that in the 1920s 200,000 Russians found shelter in Berlin. The program stressed the great importance of the presence of talented individuals from Russia for Germany. Listening to these words, I thought about the great importance of their absence for our country.

We are still losing talent at present. Our writing on maritime topics is poor in outstanding names. Meanwhile, the author of the brilliant novel "Three Minutes of Silence" Vladimov is abroad. Our theaters are experiencing a shortage of talented directors. Yet, we could not keep Yuriy Lyubimov for ourselves.

The literature and art created in emigration have been and remain Russian. Our colleagues in the writing profession who ended up beyond the boundaries of the motherland are not capable of escaping the customary frame of mind and, mainly, the domineering captivity by the great Russian language. It is hard for a man of letters to give up this wealth. However, it is harder still to work in Russian in another country: the demand for such literature is not great, you cannot pay your bills [that way]. As a rule, it is impossible to study a foreign language to such a degree that you can assert yourself as a writer. So, this is no way to get rich. The ones without resounding names of world renown have to "adapt," as, say, Vasilii Aksenov whom I used to know personally. I heard his voice carried by Western "radio voices." For them he is a find. The sarcasm of Aksenov known to me is irreplaceable when he speaks about the shortcomings and woes of our motherland. The point is how he speaks. He is not fighting for justice in the land where he was born but "puts in the time" for pay at someone else's radio station. I am not sure that all the people whose names we are now returning to the pages of our press without abuse and with praise are our long-prepared companions-in-arms in the fight for perestroika. Let us not yield to extremes and get sentimental over what is better forgotten now. What is important are the current

deeds and actions of these people, their current contribution to humanism and justice. In the magazine LITERATURNYY KURYER published in Chicago I read a confession by an emigre writer. He wrote: "Why are we here, gentlemen? I am not asking those who came here on account of good-quality sausage or clothes bought without standing in line. Everything is clear with them. I envy this simple but reliable clarity. Why have we, the writing kind, come here? We are not in exile, but on a mission? Who needs missionaries having nothing to their names except negatives of Soviet banalities?"

As they say, it is never too late for as long as you exist in this world. Times change. I am looking at an issue of the newspaper RUSSKAYA ZHIZN. The newspaper defines itself as follows: "the oldest Russian national anticommunist newspaper." A public discussion on changes in the USSR is underway in its pages, and some are even coming out in favor of certain aspects of perestroika. In the spring, I was introduced in Moscow to Vera Viren-Garchinskaya, a professor at the University of New York. She attended celebrations of the Millennium of Christianity in Russia at the invitation of the "Rodina" Society—a baroness, the granddaughter of an admiral under the tsar, an active functionary of the republican party of the USA. In October, I met her again, this time in New York. She gave me an issue of the newspaper NOVOYE RUSSKOYE SLOVO with her article. This SLOVO [word] has been heard for years with nothing but hostile intonations addressed to our system. Suddenly, there is the article by Garchinskaya about what she saw in the USSR—honest, quite objective and even favorable.

The slogan "He who is not with us is against us" which has cost the motherland so dearly has long been debunked. Leaders of the "Rodina" Society have told me that they are now profoundly revising the practice of links with our fellow countrymen abroad. Our erstwhile political intolerance left a distressing imprint on the communities of our fellow countrymen abroad as well. For years, we have cultivated our proponents, by our own definition, "progressive emigration." These people deserve our deepest respect: they were not afraid to call themselves our friends under any political circumstances, for which they have suffered a lot. But why did we have to scare away many honest people—not at all hostile to Russia—who did not at all want to be "progressive" but were simply patriots?!

There are many patriots both in the old-heritage and contemporary Russian, Ukrainian, Belorussian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, Armenian emigre communities, in the Jewish and German emigration. Thank God, we have finally waken up to them, the truly numerous and representative strata of emigration which carry weight and enjoy influence. We are not embarking on a dialogue with them now in order to make all of them "progressive." We want to find in them, our fellow countrymen, citizens of other countries, allies in what is central to the present era, in building confidence among peoples.

I have seen that in return for benevolence and tolerance we get the same. In San Francisco, I met the millionaire I. A. Sokolov. His father Anatoliy Sokolov, a student of Kustodiyev, was a well-known artist in the US. Recently, the son gave one of the best works of his father to the Tretyakov Gallery as a present. In the US, I visited Semen Vasilyevich Papkov. He was a friend of the brilliant Russian artist A. N. Benua. A museum of the Benua family recently opened in Leningrad. I could not believe my eyes when albums holding 600 (!) watercolor paintings by Benua himself landed on the table in front of me. Papkov's dream is to show his collection in Russia.

Our great national treasures ended up abroad at one point. Gradually, some of them are finding their way back. Some works by Marc Shagal returned to the motherland. The son of a Russian emigre Armand Hammer, one of the richest people in America, donated some paintings by major Russian artists acquired by him outside the borders of Russia and returned to her.

Once I met A. Litvinov, a French businessman, in Africa. He travelled with a unique album of pictures he had inherited from his father, one of the first Russian aviators. The pictures chronicled the beginnings of our national aviation. I "forced through" a Soviet visa for Litvinov. In Moscow, he handed over the album to the Museum of the Soviet Army in my presence. They thanked him and shook his hand. I thought: why shouldn't we acknowledge such priceless presents from foreigners by citations issued on behalf of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR or the government of the USSR, or perhaps by a special medal? Why shouldn't we have a sign of our appreciation of this kind? After all, this is a custom in other countries. In our country, it is just a "thank you" which one cannot keep in his family archives.

Consul General of the USSR in San Francisco V. M. Kameney told me that the emigre community donated sizable sums to the Chernobyl fund when trouble broke out in the Ukraine. Recently, even greater contributions were made, especially by the Armenian emigre community, for the benefit of victims of the earthquake in Armenia. Recently, \$200,000 was transferred for child care facilities in Irkutsk Oblast. In New York, a rich emigre asked me: "What if we, the Orthodox abroad, set up a collection to restore the Cathedral of Christ Savior?" I think it is a good idea.

In New York, Archbishop Makariy and I were invited to appear on the Russian-language TV channel. Vladimir Kozlovskiy, a journalist known in the US, anchored the broadcast. He is not at all a well-wisher of ours, and he asked us pointed questions. In turn, we responded pointedly and sincerely. The conversation turned to this being the time to end the protracted civil war, the time to engage in sincere discussions with patience and without enmity. All of us liked this idea: why shouldn't representatives of the emigre community and we, their fellow

countrymen from the USSR, sit down at a "round table" and discuss how to coexist in the future? Before the US TV audience going into thousands, Kozlovskiy demanded that I promise to report on this idea in the newspaper, which I am hereby doing.

### **Alma-Ata Young People's Fund Chairman on Youth Activities**

18300237 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA  
in Russian 19 Nov 88 p 2

[Interview with Aleksandr Kuvinyy, chairman of the Alma-Ata Youth Associations Fund, by Yu. Shaporev under the rubric "Learning Democracy": "Easy To Be Young?"]

[Text]

[Shaporev] I have heard it said that during the era of perestroika the younger generation has switched from being silent to rebellious. Demonstrations, rallies, encounters with the militia, and gangs of teenagers roaming in packs and settling scores by fighting and murdering one another...

[Kuvinyy] I am not about to judge "in the abstract" the activities of the various youth groups that tend towards extremism, including those that have fallen under the influence of irresponsible, often criminal elements, nor attempt to equate them with those of young people as a whole. There is no point in supposing that any one particular group of punks, rock fans, musicians or soccer fanatics represent a broad spectrum of the sentiments, the initiatives, or the independent activities of young people, much less embody the spirit of change and renewal in our society.

As for the the dramatic and even tragic situations that you were speaking of, the causal factors are many. They arose in the years of stagnation, corruption, and moral turpitude. Groups cultivated cruelty and violence towards one another as well as toward outsiders, and an exaggerated desire to acquire material goods without taking the trouble to create them.

In these years of stagnation, the social and intellectual energies of the young could not find an outlet within the existing structure of economic management, administration, and science. There was an awakening of civic activism, which for decades had lain in the crystal coffin of administrative edicts (to employ the precise phrase of doctor of philosophical sciences L. Ionin), summoning with it a sense of public responsibility for the fate of the country.

[Shaporev] Then your Youth Associations Fund arose just at the critical stage. The name in itself attests to the scope of the independently established social organizations.

[Kuvinyy] We unite such clubs as the Scientific Council for the Study of Human Problems, which includes psychologists, physicians, and sociologists; New Ideas, a club for artists and designers; Brigantine, a young seamen's club; Keynote, a club for amateur singing; Olympus, a gymnastics club; Mirror, a studio theater; and Diapazon, a center of creative arts, together with a number of other independently initiated groups that have already announced their intentions and are still in the formative stage. It is noteworthy that some of our independently established groups are not overly large, while others, such as the Diapazon Arts Center, include up to 3,000 workers as well as engineering and technical personnel.

[Shaporev] Perestroika calls for the active participation not only of youth but also of a variety of social sections and groups. Even in such a seemingly conservative section as the academic community commissions have arisen for the restructuring of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, together with an organizational committee of the Union of Teachers and Pedagogical Personnel and an organizational committee of the communal pedagogical movement. This situation has led the publicist S. Soloveychik in the journal *NOVOYE VREMYA* to call Fall 1988 "the Autumn of organizational committees" in the history of the teaching profession.

In addition, there is the "Green Front" movement, and in Alma-Ata we have the public committee for dealing with problems of the Aral Sea and Lake Balkhash, made up of scientists, writers, and representatives of technology and engineering. There is a charity society, and a variety of school clubs.

It seems to me that, at the height of democratization, the most valuable and important initiatives at work in the restructuring process are the programs aimed at solving grievous social, economic, and ecological problems, as well as others.

[Kuvinyy] I share your viewpoint. I would add, however, that it is desirable for social initiatives to serve the general welfare, not as a screen for people driven by ambition—the people who cause the erosion of the fundamental values in our society and who would cast doubt upon the correctness of the path that our people chose in October 1917. The spontaneous initiative of people need not succumb to chaos! Remember the dictum of V. I. Lenin that "It is necessary to combine the stormy, tumbling spring-flooded off-shore rip-tide of the toiling masses as they rally for democracy with iron discipline when the time comes to work." Lenin's words are very timely today.

[Shaporev] What is it that motivates people who participate in independently organized groups? What are their guiding values?

[Kuvinyy] I am not being original when I say that democratic traditions are still only poorly developed among us. That is why young people—and not young people only—have a great desire to familiarize themselves with democracy. And independently organized and initiated youth groups can become and function precisely as a school for instilling habits of self-direction, self-organization, and self-discipline. There is one other distinctive feature: The most active participants in the independently organized groups are those who were unable to exhibit their individuality in their former sphere of activities; for other people usually became the leaders there—people who were more obedient, more obliging, and more nondescript.

[Shaporev] Perhaps at this point it would be pertinent to quote from an article published not long ago in the journal *KOMMUNIST*, entitled "Independently Established Initiatives: A Non-Official View," of which you were a co-author:

"The heart of this movement is intelligent, creative work, and a firm belief in the needs of society ("Except for us, there is no one to do this work"), coupled with an opportunity to establish independent objectives and to direct the course of events. The creative abilities and serious commitment of independently acting people have most often been interpreted (previously) as negative qualities that got in the way of "things working smoothly." The life of the independently organized groups and associations by comparison with their social surroundings presents far greater opportunities for choice (of objectives, ways and means, and fields of endeavor), and is subject to far fewer prohibitions, both of the external kind (norms and regulations) and in the form of "self-censorship" as practiced in the years of stagnation. This makes it possible to work with far greater returns.

"The small collective (group) and the contacts within it are highly to be valued, primarily because it comes about in a natural way. It is a collective of like-minded persons, established to deal with a task that they have set for themselves. Such groups supplement the shortage existing in society of intercourse among equals (that is, in the form of dialogue and discussion), compensating for the more preemptory, "vertical" forms of social interaction."

[Kuvinyy] Yes—I was a member of a working group of the journal *KOMMUNIST* that was trying to conceptualize the experience acquired by independently established groups. It was disturbing to us that initiatives of a high, so to speak, standard of purity, were at times mixed up and placed in a single pile with certain anti-social elements such as drug addicts or the usual hobby groups, whereas there is a great difference, a vast distance, between them.

Moreover, not every idea or proposal is to be included within the definition of "initiative; for the movement of independent organizations and associations is, above all, characterized by a high sense of social purpose.

[Shaporev] You need a line of demarcation, if only to show the diversity of the social environment; that is, from a purely theoretical standpoint.

[Kuvinyy] Not so—rather, so that society may understand clearly when it is a matter of loud talk and when civic initiative is clearly evident, distinguished primarily by socially significant objectives and constructive activity; when the initiatives are of a positive nature, and when they are reactionary, if not altogether criminal in nature, their banners inscribed with the emblem of permissiveness.

Another consequence of the failure to understand the essentials of independently exercised initiative is that from the beginning it has been looked upon with distrust "from above." When the matter is about soccer fanatics, let us say, that is one thing. But, of course, in accordance with the maxim "to eliminate evil, all books must be gathered and burned," they were all treated alike, from athletic programs to clubs for the study of Yoga. In Novosibirsk, the progressive and financially independent firm Fakel [torch], which in my opinion originated the All-Union system of scientific and technical arts for young people, was utterly crushed.

[Shaporev] There had to be major shifts in our social thought before we could arrive at a realization that we cannot function properly in accordance with the principle "as if nothing would come of it," and that it is necessary to control, and be able to predict with accuracy, such an extraordinarily dynamic set of circumstances as those of young people.

[Kuvinyy] To control—that's just it. But does control really serve any purpose when it is founded on myths and rumors? Such measures are scarcely justifiable as a holding action or as a means of prohibition.

Undoubtedly, the social initiative movement is in need of material, organizational, and—perhaps most important—moral assistance well as the removal of many unjustified restrictions. The proper management of the context of young people's lives, together with a clear understanding of its inherent contradictions, will in my judgment make it possible to avoid many of the conflicts and pitfalls. Now, as never before, there is a need to consolidate forces.

[Shaporev] What sort of relations exist between the Youth Associations Fund and the other social structures?

[Kuvinyy] Since the very beginning of its activities the fund has received support from party and soviet bodies in Alma-Ata, and, of course, from the Komsomol. And timely support it was!

We have just begun to try to earn the right to self-supporting activities, and we have set our sights on paying our own way as the key to independence.

[Shaporev] I have met people who are afraid of independence. However strange that may seem, conservatives may be encountered not only in management circles. Conservatives are also to be found among workers and engineering and technical personnel. These people are skeptical about ideas of economic self-sufficiency and rental contracts, and they reject new ideas of any kind from the very outset.

[Kuvinyy] Yet we must make the effort to come to terms with them and make them our allies.

Now, with regard to economic self-sufficiency. Where are we to get the money from? Initially, it was from discotheques, video collections, and organizing various festivals, and each time we "raised the ante" and tackled more challenging tasks. We began to operate in terms of cost-accounting contracts. This year Diapazon concluded contracts for civil engineering and industrial construction projects valued at 2.5 million rubles. There was also a recent report sent by telex from the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry, confirming an agreement regarding the development by TEO of a joint Soviet-Polish project to produce personal computers.

We have a lot of such ideas.

[Shaporev] Profits and income—these are very ticklish subjects.

[Kuvinyy] Yes, they are. We sometimes hear talk about the narrowly utilitarian tendencies of the Youth Associations Fund. I think this is unfair. You may recall how youthful enthusiasm was exploited previously, while its interests went unprotected by anyone. In our independent initiative movement, however, young people can carry out their own programs. Our commercial activities are aimed at serving altruistic ends, on the one hand, and at providing financial support for young specialists, those in schools, and various youth groups on the other. Fifty percent of accountable income is allotted by the fund to the organizing of events and conducting of festivals on a city-wide scale. For example, we subsidized the Zhiger Festival sponsored by the newspaper LENINSKAYA SMENA and the celebration of Youth Day commemorating the 70th Anniversary of the All-Union Komsomol. And a basic item of expense is the assistance given to the teen-age clubs. For example, ten youngsters from the navy club Brigantine went through a three-week course at the Novorossiysk Higher Navigation School at our expense.

Among our short-term plans is the development of Youth Fund branches in the city rayons and the opening of a network of clubs and associations representing various interests for children and teenagers, and a system of cultural and sporting centers for young people located in the dining and assembly halls of institutes in the city. We are preparing to develop an inter-school combine for growing vegetables, and to open school trading stores for their sale. We are thinking of leasing a small farm and sections of land. Our Kulibins from the Diapazon Center have already completed construction of a mini-tractor and worked out a computer program for its production. Still in the planning stage are self-supporting workshops and laboratories where articles and goods may be produced for children and young people.

We are preparing to participate in an experiment to carry out plans for the social and economic development of microrayons.

In my opinion, the rayon executive committees of Alma-Ata and the city executive committee are not fully exploiting the potential of the independently initiated groups.

A painful issue for our foundation is finding physical accommodations. Right now we are giving priority attention to obtaining the lower floors of residential buildings.

Komsomol members of Energiya, the student center for creative initiative, with the support of the rector of the Alma-Ata Energy Institute, A. F. Bogatyrev, and the pro-rector, V. N. Borisov, have put in order a basement facility of the institute, where there is now a dance hall with a bar and a TV room. Usually, however, our overtures are turned down. No sooner did the youth program managers of Kazakh Television mention in a broadcast an abandoned building on Gogol Avenue in Alma-Ata—which had remained empty for many years—than it found a new proprietor, the republic State Agro-Industrial Committee, which promptly put a fence around it and carried out repairs.

We have been conducting negotiations for a prolonged period with the executive committee of the rayon soviet about the transfer to us of parts of the first floor of a residence at the corner of Mukanov and Kirov streets, but so far without success. At times we are beaten out by members of cooperatives. Rayon executive committees are more willing to provide the space to them. But it seems to me that it would be more suitable to put clubs for teenagers in them.

[Shaporev] Full recognition of the independently initiated groups is still a long way off. But businesslike collaboration with them on the part of the departments and other social structures is nevertheless in the process of becoming established. But what if it proves impossible to avoid conflicts or reduce them?

[Kuvinyi] For this it is above all necessary for the independently initiated groups themselves to demonstrate three essential qualities. They must be competent, they must be committed, and they must be possessed of the proper authority. Although it may be said of the first two qualities that they ought to be inherent characteristics of such groups from the very beginning, with respect to the latter, I am convinced that the rights of independent social initiatives and the procedures for examining proposals and protests should be bolstered by legislation—for example, in the form of a law on youth activities—as well as, of course, expressed in the charters of the social organizations. Then the management mechanism will have the material and moral incentives to cooperate with us, and the number of good-for-nothing extremists will dwindle.

Right now about fifty youth organizations of various kinds have been formed in the republic. An association for citizen initiatives is operating in Karaganda, and a youth foundation for independent initiatives is operating in Kustanay. Isn't it perhaps time to start talking about representation of the foundations for youth initiatives in various administrative bodies of the republic? And why should not the residents of the microrayons, acting jointly with the independently organized social organizations, exercise their rights to nominate activists representing them as deputies of the local organs of power? Such nominations, naturally, would be accompanied by the required public discussion of the program of activities advocated by the candidates.

In considering the further fortunes of the social initiatives of youth, we believe it essential to carry through the socio-economic experiment in economic self-sufficiency and cultural activities by our fund on a mass scale. A group of scholars in Leningrad endorses this idea. Who else does?

[Shaporev] Of course, in our conversation we have not been able to touch upon all the problems, all aspects of the new social phenomenon, or the emergence of groups in the movement for independent social initiatives. Let us hold a KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA roundtable discussion on this topic—let us not simply set it aside. We invite all persons and organizations to join this discussion that are interested—that is, everyone who is not indifferent to the fate of the young generation and to the fate of perestroyka.

**LSU Komsomol Secretary Interviewed**  
*18080017 Riga PADOMJU JAUNATNE in Latvian*  
*20 Dec 88 p 1*

[Interview by I. Helmane with the Latvian State University Komsomol organization's 1st secretary Ilmars Ziedonis: "Who Will Shatter the Mirror?"; first paragraph is PADOMJU JAUNATNE introduction]

[Text] One cannot equally evaluate all reporting and election meetings taking place in the Komsomol organizations, because many of them have not yet awakened



from a long sleep, while others did it earlier with the first roosters, not waiting for dawn. One of them are the Komsomol members at the Latvian State University [LSU]. It is doubtful that any of you would remember that two years ago PADOMJU JAUNATNE wrote about the previous LSU Komsomol conference. At that time, during the democratic, even from today's viewpoint, elections Zigurds Vaivods was elected. He was the winner of the University's first competition "The Most Student-like Student" and experienced in full the sweet feelings of victory and its outward expressions, as well as the feelings of bitterness and deceit. Without denying the achievements of the former secretary, I still must say that perestroika in the University's Komsomol started during Zigurd's time. Remember that perestroika was already announced to be an "open" one. However, the "stage curtains", especially at our republic's economic, Party, and Komsomol life stages, have not really been opened yet. The leaders of the University's Party organization so often repeated that everyone has to start perestroika with himself that there was no time left for them to do it themselves. I do not want to imply that the University's Komsomol was the only one to be on the front line of the changes, but rather that the others remained behind.

My first question to the newly elected Komsomol secretary Ilmars Ziedonis was about the 32nd LSU reporting and election conference.

[Ziedonis] Many people misunderstood the conference's task, thinking that it will dissolve the Komsomol and form a Students Federation. After some time the disappointed disappeared... although during the conference we also discussed this very important problem for the future. Namely, the organization of the LSU Students Federation and the creation of the republic's Student Council. At the present time, a working group consisting of students from the juridical and philology departments is being formed. This group will polish up its Charter and Program. I think that in late December we will organize a forum of the LSU students and will discuss exactly this issue.

[Helmane] Since the Komsomol has not been "closed", how will it work in the future?

[Ziedonis] It is said in one of the conference resolution's paragraphs that we must get rid of those Komsomol members who only formally belong to the organization, are not interested in its problem, do not pay the membership dues, etc. Many are afraid of the procedure itself. However, it is not complicated at all. One must only fill out a small form and come once (on Thursday, at 3 p.m.) to the University's Komsomol committee. Many students are afraid that they will experience repressions, will not be allowed to go to practice abroad, etc.

Of course, this process cannot take on a mass character. However, the ideal case would be if from the 96 percent of the LSU Komsomol members some 30 to 40 percent

would remain. To think about it, 6000 Komsomol members sounds impressive. One can "cover" with this force half of a rayon; however, in reality it is not so. Therefore, first, by reducing the membership of this sociopolitical organization to the previous levels, we would be able to transform quantity into quality.

Second, the rest of the students could join other organizations and fraternities which would be involved in environment protection, historical studies, etc. They would work out themselves the regulations, membership payments system, and symbolism. However, all this is in the future. Meanwhile, the departments were given more independence. Students decide themselves, who will lead the social life in the department; namely, the Komsomol buro, labor union, or department's Students council. Such councils are already working at the teachers', chemistry, and philology departments.

The conference resolution has a paragraph that stipulates the inclusion into the newspaper PADOMJU STUDENTS independent columns representing the interests of the youth's public organizations. It could become our "free press", where any student will be able to express his own views on any subject, even if they do not coincide with the LSU administration's, or the Party committee's views.

I think that these independent columns will appear soon, because Ilze Brinkmane from PADOMJU STUDENTS is also a member of the LSU Komsomol committee.

Students have become socially active. They actively participated in all the latest meetings, demonstrations and pickets that took place in our republic, mainly in Riga.

The most important problem for the students is the demilitarization of the universities. We have already had boycotts and pickets. The Riga Polytechnical Institute, Latvian State University, Riga Medical Institute, and Latvian Agricultural Academy submitted their requests to the LaSSR CP Central Committee's 1st secretary J. Vagris, who took them with him to Moscow. A working group was organized there, because similar requests were expressed by college students from Novosibirsk, Omsk, Tomsk, and Lithuania. The LSU military department is the first among all military departments in our republic to change its work in accordance with students' requests. Of course, it was not easy, but it proves one more time that many painful problems could be resolved on the spot, as long as we learn how to discuss things, how to listen to others with attention, and how to understand without screaming at each other.

[Helmane] What does it mean today to be a Komsomol secretary?

[Ziedonis] On one hand, there is no longer any great pressure from all sides and much less instruction, orders, and advice. Think for yourself, make decisions, and act.

On the other hand, I must know each student, his proposals and requests. I must think that I can help him. I must immediately react to all sociopolitical events in our life and show my attitudes toward them. It is very good, since it does not allow me to sit complacently in the secretary's chair.

We must increase the influence of the Komsomol. Everybody is thinking how to do it. When we cannot figure it out, we organize a ball. But a ball means to make up to the youth.

At the present time, the LSU Komsomol committee has 13 members. Ilmars thinks that there should be even less. During the conference the best students did not receive honorary certificates but were given ribbons. When one enters the LSU Komsomol committee, he does not get an impression that he is among diplomats. People wearing close-fit (beyond the possibilities of our industry) suits are replaced by young people in sweaters who do not have fixed business hours. We may argue that in the past it was exactly the exterior signs that were above ideas. Could I respond that it is a different time now and nothing of that sort may occur again? I understand that it may happen again, because it does happen every day and not in some land behind the mirror, but around us. Who will shatter the mirror and who will pick up the pieces to prevent them from getting into people's eyes?

**Reader Calls For Soviet School Humanization,  
Praises LPF**

*18080016 Riga PADOMJU JAUNATNE in Latvian  
14 Dec 88 p 4*

[Excerpts from a Letter by Normunds Kamergrauzis:  
"Unshed Tears"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] They taught us in school to fight against abstract humanism and pacifism. They told us to assess events first from the position of class struggle. If somebody is thinking differently, there is nothing to cry about; if he is being beaten up, look for the nearest stone, and throw it at this person who thinks differently... The hero of the young pioneers Pavlik Morozov found his stone too. The most noble idea of how to raise children was for many years connected with the name of this unfortunate boy.

Therefore, the past could be called the time of deceived people. It so happened that those people who in the 50's and 60's were called the believers, and, therefore, the deceived ones [passage omitted], today do not appear as such, while the practitioners of vulgar atheism have presented themselves now in the most unattractive light. [passage omitted] Maimed bodies, ruined lives, and corrupt morals were left behind the figures of clay idols, which the bosses were displaying in their offices and their subordinates were carrying through the streets during the great State holidays. Morals were so corrupt that reading about the atrocities of 1937, 1941, 1949, and other years, one cannot believe that all this had

happened in our State and in our times. The corruption of morals brought ancient Rome to its downfall. This is a lesson of the past. The Jewish people have preserved the experiences of Noah's Ark and the perished cities.

Should not we admit that the social and economic degradation of our State, for which we are using now a harmless word "stagnation", goes hand in hand with the everyday life of the lost people?

At the present time, certain spheres of life are being changed and certain qualities are being examined. Man is also changing, because during the moment of "taking inventory", the majority of the society did not have stable moral and ethical values, even when one would carefully search for them. [passage omitted]

I am not so old as to be able to compare the times. However, it seems to me now that more than ever man needs spiritual, rather than material values.

The world's history does not know a single generation that would live in a proper way. My generation is not an exception. It is the last (I hope it would be so) human community that has directly felt the stagnation times. As well as the products of all the previous distortions. Unwillingly, we inherited also those properties that were burned in our minds as the only and correct forms of life and expression. Especially, this is true for the school, where its workers, using brushes of all sizes and paints delivered from the top, were painting the front of the building and were afraid to see what was hidden behind this front. They did not want to see, because in spite of everything, they still had a notion about the truth.

Every man has inherent desires to believe, because without faith there is no man. He has inherent desires to hope, because without hope, there is darkness. He has inherent desire to love (those are the strongest) and be loved. However, something very important is missing in our life.

Our souls are as neglected as our State. Realizing (with all the consequences that come from this realization) that there will not be any other time for this work, we have turned to the most neglected problem of our life, that is, to the inner world of man. Without this element's cleanliness there cannot be a basis for any good intents and efforts, sales of flags and waving them, and demonstrations for clean air, sea, and land. The rebirth of virtues and moral recovery have announced their return, because society has recognized its faults and has understood their causes.

The newly formed Latvian Peoples' Front has stood up for the priority of the general human values and for such a policy, when an individual and the people are no longer means, but the goal. Maybe that is why the most important event of the congress for me was the service at Doms cathedral. The pastor Modris Plate in his sermon was talking about the prodigal son. [passage omitted]

We have broken out and have chosen a better road, the road of the Prodigal son back home, back to his Father, who was happier than anybody else for the return and rebirth. There were very many people at this service. Many of them cried. Those were tears of sacred joy for the house that has opened and the Father, who is very near. The unshed tears of my generation.

With that the thoughts about the humanization of the school are presently being connected.

In my opinion, one of the most important elements of this task is the necessity to introduce a course of religious history, or some other subject explaining the Bible. On one hand, we must do it in order to somewhat decently learn the Western European culture, to which we also belong, because without the knowledge of the Bible it cannot be either perceived, or understood. [passage omitted]

On the other hand, this sacred book is holding the ethical experience of several millennia. It is a library of the general human values obtained during centuries.

The Bible teaches us: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." (1. Thes. 5, 21). They did not teach us in school that the Bible is an outstanding cultural and historical monument, and that the brightest minds of the world were inspired by it. [passage omitted]

The majority of our society was robbed of its values, and we must get them back, since time is running out. [passage omitted] One of the necessary things is to get rid of the militant Philistinism, which is often presented to us as scientific atheism.

At the organizational meeting of the Latvian Peoples' Front the Roman Catholic bishop Janis Pujats expressed his justified concerns. He spoke about the insecurity that takes over a family of believers sending their child to a Soviet school, where the most precious, highest ideal of childhood, the child Jesus is taken away from him. And not only in the moral plane, but also in front of the Soviet laws. I know cases where children of the clergy were insulted and laughed at, and during the breaks tortured in the school's toilets. It must not be in the future that the school as a social institution is used for prosecuting religion and humiliating human dignity. The school must be neutral in its attitude toward religious convictions and allow the opportunity to study religion or to study opposite teachings. Such an approach is taken in Estonia at the Sarema Island's two schools.

It seems that militant atheism has outlived itself by creating a theory that everything is allowed which did not pass the test of time. Man is not created to break down and perish. There is something more valuable and supreme, namely, the understanding of spiritual life, during which one does not do any harm to himself and others. The Church has never forgotten this; persecuted and oppressed she always supported man, which the social institutions saw only as a tool for the realization of goals.

**Estonian Activists, Officials Assess 1988 Political Year**

18000425 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA  
in Russian 24 Dec 88 p 3

[Article by V. Ivanov, SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA correspondent: "From the Positions of Reason and Realism"]

[Text] Political Results of 1988 was the official description of the meeting held by the members of the public on the initiative of the Estonian Popular Front in the Tallinn city hall, on 22 December.

This article is not a shorthand report or a report on various steps but rather an attempt to interpret, together with its participants, the events which occurred in the republic's political life in 1988. Naturally, it is based on the impressions of the people's meeting.

Perhaps we should begin with the fact that on the stage of the big city assembly hall, which was packed, the state flags of the Estonian and Armenian SSRs had been placed, interspersed with the tricolor national flags were placed on either side of the presidium. The assembly honored with a minute of silence the memory of the victims of the earthquake in the fraternal Caucasian republic. Urns for the collection of funds for the victims had been placed in the lobby. All the money, as Edgar Savisaar said, in answering a question from the hall, will be given to the representatives of the Armenian cultural society in Estonia, and sent to Armenia.

In considering the results of the past year, Mikk Titma, Estonian Communist Party Central Committee secretary, who was the first speaker, expressed a view with which, I believe, everyone would totally agree, both those who were in the hall and the readers of these lines: Hardly ever, at any other time in the past, have the people of Estonia (which includes the representatives of all ethnic groups living on the territory of the republic) have so intensively considered political, social, economic and ideological problems as they had in 1988. It would be neither an exaggeration nor stretching a point to describe this period, in two words, as a political year. Many people, including the leadership of the Estonian Communist Party and rank and file members covered a tremendous distance in the relatively brief 12 months, from the silent and customary "profound satisfaction" to active participation in the discussion of topical problems, sharp debates and universally acknowledged pluralism. Such pluralism has not become customary to everyone and some people still consider it alien, a one-way street. As a whole, however, variety and even differences of opinion have become quite customary concepts. How not to recall here M.S. Gorbachev's speech to the UN General Assembly, in which the Soviet leader said that all of us must get used to living together even if we do not agree with one another always and in all things. We simply have no other choice.

The meeting at city hall also indicated that differences in views and in approaches to the same problems may exist even among like-minded people, not to mention among people holding opposite views.

"Mass sociopolitical movements have become a reality of the present," M. Titma emphasized. "All of us must take this into consideration. The Popular Front, the 'green' society, the society for the preservation of ancient monuments, the OSTK and the Union of Labor Collectives are all realities and the relationship among them should be guided by the principles of political realism. Excesses and errors were allowed by everyone and one must be able to acknowledge them rather than turn them into insoluble problems."

Having chosen as an example the draft law on the language, the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee secretary expressed the view that if from the very beginning of the discussion of this problem, i.e., before a sufficiently clear concept had been developed, had there been no thoughtless and occasionally irresponsible and unnecessary emotional addresses (at meetings, in the press and on radio and television), there would not have been the type of stress in relations between the two main linguistic groups in the republic, as it exists today (or, rather, existed until very recently). That is why, before undertaking a discussion on the law on citizenship, we must take into consideration previous errors and submit problems to nationwide referenda with profoundly thought-out and comprehensively considered and legally substantiated suggestions which will not, once again, become reasons for quarrels.

If we are able to reach agreement on these two problems, which are the most pressing today, the possibility will develop, finally, to address ourselves to the main and most vital problems: to draw the line of struggle precisely where it should be, against the administrative-command system of economic and political management and against neo-Stalinism in all of its manifestations. It is on this "front line" that we have quite serious enemies who, already today, are ready to proclaim that all of our difficulties in the economy and in solving the national problem are the consequence... of perestroika and glasnost, and who are unwilling to acknowledge that perestroika itself was brought to life by the need to reject stagnation and crisis phenomena in society.

M. Titma concluded his speech wishing to all those assembled success in the new year and, above all, for 1989 to become a year of specific action and implementation of the progressive initiatives which were discussed and earmarked in 1988.

In addressing the assembly in city hall, California (U.S.) University professor Reyn Tageper, known to the Estonian readers for his many publications in the republic press in recent years, hardly called for the overthrow of the existing system. This American professor of Estonian origin emphasized the fact that politics is the art of the

possible. Therefore, if the supporters of the IME intend to achieve serious successes, they must become oriented toward close reciprocal cooperation with the Russian Federation, Latvia, Lithuania, Belorussia and the other Union republics.

Generally speaking, in Tageper's opinion, both in our republic and throughout the country striking changes are taking place.

Edgar Savisaar, who spoke after Tageper, reviewed the events of 1988 which preceded and paralleled the creation of the Popular Front. He analyzed the resolutions of the 11th (September) and 13th (December) Estonian Communist Party Central Committee plenums and the 16 November and 5 December sessions of the republic's Supreme Soviet. He also discussed other important landmarks in Estonian political life. One could agree or disagree with some of his assessments (for example, E. Savisaar believes that the 13th ECP Central Committee Plenum is a step backward compared with the 11th); nonetheless, the pluralism of opinions implies tolerance of a viewpoint conflicting with the universally adopted one. One point in his discussions, however, puzzled me, to say the least.

In speaking of the Intermovement, the speaker categorically claimed that by order "from above," the activities of the initiators of the Intermovement were not to be subjected to a critical analysis.

These words had quite a familiar echo. One did not have to strain one's memory too hard: It was precisely the same type of condemnation, but "in a mirror reflection," that could be traced in virtually all public speeches... by the very same leaders of the Intermovement. Which one was right?

Maro Lauristin believes, somewhat disagreeing with E. Savisaar (although she justifiably blamed the republic press, including our newspaper) that that same Intermovement should be given the broadest possible rostrum, so that its people could openly and frankly express their views and positions. In that case the republic's population will be able to compare and draw conclusions as clearly and as knowledgeably as possible.

"We must proceed from the realities and take them into consideration," M. Lauristin emphasized. "To this effect we must be extremely tolerant and patient. We must not hasten events but unravel the complex knots in which they are interwoven. We need allies and not an increased number of opponents."

One can only agree with these words. Let me only add that gaining as many allies as possible would be, probably, inconceivable without sensible compromise. This does not apply to the Popular Front alone.

### **Estonian Supsov Debates Status of State Language**

*18000395a Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA  
in Russian 14, 15 Dec 88*

[ETA report: "9th Session of Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation": "On the Status of a State Language in the Estonian SSR: Debate on a Report by Deputy E. Pyldroos"]

[14 Dec 88 pp 1-3]

[Excerpts] Of all the questions under discussion at this session the status of a state language and the draft law to that effect have of late attracted the greatest public attention and, quite frankly, have created a very unhealthy situation in our republic. A segment of the population regards this as an attempt to infringe up its rights. It is these personal worries and fear, reinforced by certain irresponsible statements, that have resulted in a virtual schism on the basis of ethnicity. The status of the Estonian language and the draft Language Law have been hotly debated everywhere, finding ardent supporters and even more ardent opponents. Despite all its negative effects this discussion has also had its positive aspects. Thanks to it the original version of the draft law has now been amended in numerous very substantial ways; these changes have eliminated the lion's share of the conflicts. That is why despite all the acrid debate at this session the deputies have managed to arrive at complete unanimity on the fundamental points.

"Estonia's digression from normal development 48 years ago has resulted in a profound social, economic and political crisis and today has worsened interethnic relations to the extreme," emphasized deputy L. Yusma in her speech. "There is only one solution to this crisis: Estonia's sovereign development. Only a free people living on free land can treat other peoples with esteem and respect. However, some leaders of Intermovement who persist in propagandizing a great-power, colonialist policy continue to attempt to gain the support of that segment of the Russian-speaking population which does not understand that it is being deceived in order to incite interethnic hostility."

"Free and independent development takes the interests of all the people who live in Estonia into account. If we want to be a sovereign republic, then we must ourselves learn and accustom others to the idea that decisions made on our issues by higher-level organs are of no consequence. We have had enough of endless negotiations with Moscow and pleading for additional rights. All that does is formalize our de facto powerlessness. A state is sovereign when its organs of state power and administration have full authority within its territory. Our people are concerned for their sovereignty, language and culture because these things are endangered. It is



obvious that we cannot and should not retreat from the principles expressed on 16 November and set forth in reports to the 11th Estonian CP Central Committee Plenum."

"Estonia is waiting for IME [Self-Managing Estonia; "ime" is the Estonian word for "miracle"]. Hundreds of thousands of Estonian citizens regard IME as their life goal. IME should guarantee the economic, political and sociocultural development of a sovereign Estonia. We must work to put our economy back on its feet again. We must work to ensure that the future state ruled by law will have an economic foundation, that beautiful dreams are transformed into actions and that IME becomes a reality. Then the tremendous inequity in the distribution of food products which is currently causing so much concern to rural residents would disappear."

"Only Estonian can be the official language of Estonia. We cannot allow our native language to one day become a relic of the past. If a language disappears then the people who speak that language disappear as well. Recently in Estonia opportunities to use Estonian have become ever more circumscribed. In view of this people are waiting for the passage of a Language Law and the proclamation of Estonian as the official language. It seems that it would be obvious to everyone that a law of this type is not discriminatory against any individual of another nationality who regards Estonia as his home, who wants us all to be equally concerned for Estonia's development. Rural residents are no longer willing for the passage of the Language Law to be postponed. If the foot-dragging does not end their disillusionment will be unpardonably great, and that could deliver a great blow to people's morale."

"This question arises with ever greater urgency in connection with the distortion of facts and their false interpretation by the central press and Central Television. Truthful Russian-language information is needed, and those who spread rumors deserve to be punished."

"Ecological problems also deserve a great deal of attention. These problems have already been discussed in detail here today. Therefore we approve of the proposal that northeastern Estonia be declared an ecological disaster area."

"There is only one Estonia for all the people who live here; we must preserve and protect it. We know that the republic government and the Estonian CP share with us the people's concern for its future."

"I would like to share with those here today some of my voters' opinions," said deputy K. Volkova. "We know that the original draft Language Law evoked many negative and at times painful reactions, some of them quite justified. The second draft law is acceptable to both the Estonian-speaking and the Russian-speaking populations of our republic. Now points of agreement have been found in this draft, i.e. the pendulum has more or

less come to rest. If we continue to debate interethnic relations until the CPSU Central Committee plenum many new proposals could be made during that period of time and the balance destroyed. Discussion has been going on for a long time already; it cannot go on forever."

"From the very start of restructuring people's hopes were raised, but thus far little has been accomplished. Every deputy can see the tense situation in his or her own collective, and it is reflected in letters from our voters, both Estonians and non-Estonians. Believe me, comrades, people are tired of all this. In our city 70 percent of the people belong to the native ethnic group. At the enterprise where I work there are 30 percent non-Estonians. It is precisely in mixed collectives that one can best see sore points in interethnic relations."

"For an Estonian the question of language is a question of the survival of his nation. Non-Estonians are concerned about the future of their children and about what education will be like in this republic after the Language Law is passed. The suffering and pain on both sides are understandable. But the new draft law resolves these problems. In view of the current situation in our republic we must strive for consolidation; we should weigh everything carefully, think it over, evaluate it and be able to listen to each other and make the correct decision on this difficult and very important matter."

"I feel that the most important task in view of the existing political situation is consolidation of all the people of Estonia and, in sensitivity to the concerns of the Estonian and non-Estonian population, I feel it is essential that we discuss this amended version of this Estonian SSR law."

"Several voters at the 5 December Supreme Soviet session suggested that the amendment to the constitution granting the status of state language to Estonian be formulated as follows: 'The state language of the Estonian SSR is Estonian, regulations governing the use of languages within the territory of the Estonian SSR are to be established by the Language Law, and state guarantees are also hereby established for Russian and other languages.'"

"Secondly: we should approve the new draft Language Law and pass it at this session with our own amendment to Article 8: 'Acts by organs of state power and state administration are to be adopted and published in Estonian, with authentic translations to be published in Russian.'"

"I propose that at the next session of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet an addition be made to articles 7 and 38 of the Administrative Code concerning penalties for individuals found guilty of violating the Language Law."

"We understand the feelings of deputies and voters from Narva, Sillamya and Kokhtla-Yarve, where a majority of the population is Russian-speaking. However, comrades, for the sake of our republic's future what we need most of all is unity of opinion. Therefore on behalf of the Tartu group of Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet deputies I hereby submit a proposal that is contained in the new draft resolution: that the corrected and augmented draft Language Law be submitted at the next Supreme Soviet session in January 1989 for the purpose of mandatory adoption."

"The proclamation of Estonian as official language and the draft Language Law have provoked a lively debate," said V. Rayangu, chairman of the Estonian SSR State Committee for Education. "Some people see only the negative aspects of this, but in fact there is also much that is positive here. There is tremendous new interest in Estonian, and today we are faced with a situation in which we cannot supply all educational institutions, language courses and cooperatives with the requisite number of adequately skilled instructors."

"The State Committee for Education sees two main problems at the present time: firstly, an adequate supply of teaching cadres and, secondly, methodological groundwork for the teaching of Estonian to non-Estonians. I can quote some statistics with regard to the teacher shortage. For example, in schools in northeastern Estonia where Russian is the language of instruction 27 more Estonian instructors are needed. In Narva, where the gorispolkom has been attentive to the needs of teachers and has provided them with apartments there is nonetheless a shortfall of 14 teachers. What solutions does our state committee propose? We have adopted a number of specific decisions providing for a 100-percent pension for retired teachers who teach Estonian in general educational schools, vocational and technical schools and tehnikums where Russian is the language of instruction. This will give experienced educators with a long record of service an interest in working as teachers of Estonian at Russian-language schools."

"Secondly, we have equalized the salaries of teachers of Estonian and teachers of Russian."

"At the present time the republic Advanced Teacher Training Institute is offering intensive courses for teachers of Estonian as a foreign language. The persons attending these courses will one day be teaching the language to adults. The teachers are being provided with the necessary methodological materials. We will continue this type of instruction in the future."

"The Tallinn Pedagogical Institute has established and is already conducting advanced training courses for teachers of Estonian in Russian schools. Similar courses will also be offered in the future. We regard the training of an adequate number of the appropriate cadres at our VUZs as a long-range solution. The question is asked, why was

this not done before now? We had very serious difficulties fulfilling our admissions plan. Young people simply were not entering the appropriate specialized fields. This year the number of applicants was significantly greater than the number of students we could enroll. Therefore the Tallinn Pedagogical Institute has accepted more than its planned number of students to study to be teachers of Estonian in Russian-language schools."

"Language courses are being established in the cities. More attention needs to be devoted to their work in the future, both to their material base and to the nature of instruction offered by them. Copying equipment is the most pressing problem for language schools. We have requested assistance in this regard from the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers. Changes in the organizational structure of these educational institutions should also be considered. Perhaps it would be reasonable to grant them the same status as small enterprises, where the wage scale is better."

"A word about methodology. A specific system for updating Estonian textbooks used in Russian-language schools has been developed. Students who commenced the study of Estonian in Russian-language schools this year have already received the new textbook. Each year the quantity of textbooks will increase until all classes have them. We have announced a contest for two textbooks. A specific contract has already been concluded with the author of one textbook. A textbook for adults is being created. In this regard I would like to note the great amount of work done by specialists at Tartu State University, Tallinn Pedagogical Institute and many other institutions."

"The republic Advanced Teacher Training Institute is drawing up a curriculum and methodological materials for the teaching of Estonian to adults. These were ordered by Kokhtla-Yarve, but the materials are quite applicable to other regions of the republic as well. One year ago the Pedagogical Institute established a special center to handle problems pertaining to the teaching of Estonian to Russian speakers. The initial results of the center's work will be available by the first of the year."

"In the course of discussion of the draft Language Law a whole series of questions came up pertaining to the language of instruction at vocational and technical schools, tehnikums and VUZs. These problems were also discussed at a conference of Estonian educators. Related articles have appeared in the press."

"The admissions exam on Estonian in several specialized fields for student groups using Russian as their language of instruction has been the subject of disagreement. Since secondary schools are not yet providing adequate knowledge of the Estonian language this examination cannot be made obligatory for all specialized fields. Simultaneously with the introduction of an exam on Estonian for many specialized fields of study where the language of instruction is Estonian an entrance exam

in Russian was also introduced. We will continue this practice in coming years, and young people should take appropriate action in view of that fact."

"I support the proclamation of Estonian as an official language at the constitutional level."

"At a special session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Comrade Ryuytel, chairman of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, said this: 'Today the most important thing for our republic is complete consolidation of all social forces and citizens around the course of restructuring.'" said deputy P. Subbota at the beginning of his speech. "And definition of an official language in this republic could exacerbate confrontation, or it could also foster consolidation. Unilateral proclamation of Estonian as the state language will not promote mutual understanding and convergence among peoples; it would not be a democratic act. For decades our republic accepted graduates from educational institutions throughout the Union without making any attempt to teach them the language or fill out documents in Estonian. This unjustly infringes upon those people's jobs, putting many of them back at square one. The position of the collective of the Estonian Maritime Fleet as set forth in the resolution of the 11th Conference of its party organization is as follows: 'We support the statements of the 11th Estonian CP Central Committee Plenum concerning the official status of Estonian, yet at the same time we feel it essential that the status of Russian within the territory of the Estonian SSR be defined as well. We feel that the present version of the Language Law requires substantial additional work. The time period for discussion of it must be extended in view of the suggestions and proposed changes which are still being received. The final version of the law should be adopted on the basis of the CPSU Central Committee plenum's political line 'On Improvement of Interethnic Relations'. It is essential that simultaneously with the Language Law a plan for a republic government program be drawn up which will implement the law without negatively affecting the dynamic development of the economy and the rise in republic citizens' standard of living which should result from the transition to republic cost-accounting.'"

"We cannot agree with the latest version of the language amendment to the constitution: it does not protect the rights of Russian and other languages, it merely cites protection for those rights under the Language Law, which does not as yet exist."

"I propose that Article 5 be worded thus: 'Estonian is the state language of the Estonian SSR and Russian is the language of interethnic communication. Policy concerning the use of Estonian and other languages is to be established by the Estonian SSR Language Law.' The second half of the amendment should counter any notion that under this formulation Estonian could be relegated to a lesser role, because its role will be established by the Language Law. This is the most democratic language amendment to the Estonian SSR Constitution; this is the

wise solution offered by our Lithuanian comrades, it is the mandate of many thousands of my constituents, who actually represent a number greater than that by a factor of three or four, since they also speak for their families."

"Exacerbation of interethnic relations has created a difficult situation in our republic," noted deputy A. Lugovoy in his speech. "The original draft of the Language Law which was submitted for public discussion divided the population of our republic on the basis of ethnicity. Tendentiousness of information and the efforts of certain forces to play on Estonians' ethnic sentiments resulted in misunderstanding on the part of the Estonian population of the feelings and interests of the Russian-speaking population on the subject of language. Therefore I appeal to the deputies in their discussion of this matter to take a constructive approach that will take into consideration the entire population's interests, to remember that the position taken by them will to a great extent determine the further nature and direction of interethnic relations."

"The draft Language Law exhibits signs of hastiness in the preparation of many of its points, a not completely wise political course and contradictions vis-a-vis the Constitution of the USSR."

"The draft law in question reflects the interests of one people and does not take into account the fact that Russian speakers comprise approximately 40 percent of the republic population and that their rights and interests would be infringed upon by this law." "TherKf7fe I propose that along with recognition of Estonian as the state language of the Estonian SSR Russian be granted the status of official language of interethnic communication. All articles of the law should be brought into agreement with this proposal and public discussion of the Language Law and the additions and changes made by this session should take place simultaneously with informational work and commentary concerning its articles and sections."

"Every people has one native language, and only one," declared deputy Kh. Teder, "and the death of that language marks the end of the existence of that people and the development of its culture. A people as a whole and each of its members individually have a right to use and at the same time are obligated to defend and develop their native language in their homeland in all places and at all times without hindrance. These thoughts were expressed to me in a parting message from the voters of Myaryamaaskiy Electoral District."

"I pass on to you their united viewpoint: the Estonian language should be declared the official language of the Estonian SSR and the Language Law should be the basis for determining its usage."

"The Estonian language today needs state protection because preservation of the language is seriously threatened and the sphere within which the language is used

has been constantly shrinking. Above all this is due to many years of incorrect extensive economic development pursued by republic leadership organs contrary to the republic's best interests and due to those organs' negative attitude toward the use of Estonian. The Estonian CP Central Committee has become virtually monolingual: Russian-speaking. In the overwhelming majority of cases the Estonian CP Central Committee congresses and plenums and meetings sponsored by the Central Committee are conducted in Russian. In the past the only people who gave speeches in Estonian were representatives from rural rayons and certain members of the creative intelligentsia."

"I cannot recall a single instance when the republic's ideological leader for many years, who spoke Estonian fluently, ever in all those years spoke Estonian at any of the aforementioned forums. I would not like to believe that he was guided by strict orders from the higher leadership, because that would be in contradiction to Leninist principles; Lenin believed that appropriate legislation was the only defense small languages and small peoples had against larger peoples and languages."

"It was a pleasant surprise for all ordinary listeners to hear a speech by our present ideological leader given in their native language in January. For many years leadership style has been strictly centralized and a certain speaking style became an unwritten law for lower-level officials as well. It seemed that even the first secretaries of the Tallinn Party Gorkom, who were quite fluent in Estonian, immediately after their election forgot how to speak their native language. However, it is quite understandable that people who do not know or have poor fluency in Estonian give their speeches in Russian. Although the meetings of the republic Council of Ministers and its Presidium were still conducted in both languages, very few resolutions written in Estonian were sent down. It is probably for that reason that many ministries followed their leaders' example and, eager to make a good impression, conducted their business in Russian. The Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium is among the few centralized republic institutions and agencies under their jurisdiction which conduct the bulk of their affairs in Estonian."

"Rejection of Estonian as an official language will negatively effect the way ministries make decisions and will only serve exacerbate the current situation. By disseminating untranslated instructions from union ministries which were not applicable to conditions in our republic the central apparatus has contributed to passive thinking and incompetence among its personnel. For there is not a single union ministry that can issue a useful set of instructions that are applicable both to the Pacific coast and to Vilsandi Island."

"Estonian requires full state protection and should immediately be declared the state language."

"It is heartening to note that after this year's June Plenum of the Estonian CP Central Committee, and in particular after the 11th Estonian CP Central Committee Plenum, the situation in leadership organs and a number of republic departments has improved, thereby expanding the realm within which Estonian is used."

"Today, just like 20 days ago," noted deputy V. Koltakov, "each one of us must make a decision of great importance to himself or herself. We must define our attitude toward the idea that from now on Estonian will be the official language in Estonian territory. It appears that this quite natural step needs to be taken, casting doubts aside, particularly since this was discussed at the 11th Estonian CP Central Committee Plenum. The speech by Comrade Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian CP, quite clearly expressed the fact that there cannot and should not be any infringement on the rights of any Estonian SSR citizens when Estonian is declared the republic's official language."

"What have our voters experienced since the Estonian CP Plenum? The Law on a State Language was submitted for public discussion and many of the points it contained were nothing less than an attempt to restrict the rights of and discriminate against the Russian-speaking population, to refuse to give Russian speakers guarantees of an education in their own language. A number of points in the draft law are clearly in contradiction to the principles of the resolution on interethnic relations adopted at the 19th Party Conference as well as to the principles set forth in Article 2 of the UN General Assembly's Universal Declaration of Human Rights."

"After all that is it right to pass an amendment to the Estonian SSR Constitution concerning the status of Estonian? I think not. First we need to explain to our constituents what this amendment will mean to each one of us in practice, in everyday life. This is a question which is of great concern to the entire multiethnic collective where I work."

"Workers' meetings were held for the purpose of achieving a better understanding of and clarifying the opinion of our collective on all particulars. The status of Estonian was discussed by the plant's labor collective council. The outcome of that discussion was that we are firmly convinced that such an important decision should be made with consideration given to the real language situation in our republic, a situation which has developed over a period of decades and cannot be changed instantly. The passage of changes to the Estonian Constitution under conditions where there is no practical guarantee that they will be realized could lead and, as practical experience has shown, has already led to unnecessary complications and even conflicts in the area of interethnic relations. We already have had an unfortunate experience with unjustified hastiness: the adoption of amendments to the constitution which have resulted in complications not only within our republic but also beyond its borders."

"In my opinion it would be more correct for us at this point in time to decide not how to write into the constitution an article on the status of the language, but rather to discuss and adopt a program, a series of measures, realization of which would permit Estonian to be made the official language. The constitutions of three union republics—Azerbaijan, Georgia and Armenia, and recently of Lithuania—recognize the languages of the indigenous peoples as official languages. However, neither the status of those languages nor the specific areas in which they are to be used have been defined with sufficient clarity in those republics. In Azerbaijan, Georgia and Armenia attempts have been made in one and the same article to ensure both concern for the development of the native language and unrestricted use of the languages of all other nationalities residing in those republics. Yet this has not eliminated contradictions in interethnic relations in those republics."

"We do not want to grant a constitutional right to only one state language when there are two functioning official languages in this republic: Estonian and Russian. It is unrealistic to attempt to change this situation by adding an article to the constitution."

"Taking all these things into account, I appeal to you, esteemed deputies, to give consideration in your decision to the real situation, not to be hasty and not to get ahead of yourselves. Much is already being done in our republic to ensure that Estonian will become the state language. But these are only the first steps; we must go farther along this path. The granting of official status to Estonian at this time would be premature, and I urge you not to do so. I propose that the matter of an official language and the new draft Language Law be submitted for public discussion and that further work be done on the draft law to take voters' opinions into consideration; after broad discussion in the mass media and after further corrections have been made we can return to these matters."

"On the agenda of today's Supreme Soviet session is the matter of an official language for our republic," said deputy S. Makarova. "It should be noted that this session was preceded by active discussion of the draft Language Law. This discussion took place in all labor collectives in the city of Kokhtla-Yarve and at meetings of gorsovet deputies."

"Supreme Soviet deputies have met with their constituents. In the course of numerous discussions virtually everywhere the working people of our city expressed their unambiguous opinion that it is essential that we grant Estonian constitutional status as our official language. This is due to the sincere desire of all our voters to provide for fruitful development of the Estonian language within the territory of our republic, the right of the native population to conduct their affairs in their native tongue in every part of their republic, to step up the work of ethnic scientific and creative collectives."

"On account of this city residents' interest in Estonian has increased significantly. People realize that it is not enough merely to declare a language official: in order for it really to begin to function everywhere people must know it. This year alone the number of persons studying Estonian in the various groups established at enterprises in our city has increased by a factor of three."

"However, discussion of the draft law has demonstrated quite clearly that many points contained in it are not in accordance with the decision of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and in some instances not only do not protect but actually infringe upon the rights of citizens of other nationalities who do not presently speak Estonian. This fact has had a negative effect on our constituents' attitudes toward the draft law. They have given their deputies a mandate: to make Estonian the official language while at the same time providing constitutional protection for the use of Russian as the language of interethnic communication. We feel that this matter will be resolved in accordance with the constitution, which states that the most important acts of state must be submitted for public discussion prior to their passage by the Supreme Soviet. The proposed amendment to the Estonian SSR Constitution has not yet been submitted for public discussion. Therefore it seems quite logical and simply essential to submit this matter for public discussion and only afterwards to make a decision on it in accordance with the law."

"It is completely false to claim that the Russian language is so large that it requires no protection. In our republic it is the language of a minority, the language of interethnic communication not only between Estonians and Russians but also between members of all the various nationalities living in this republic. Furthermore, this issue concerns every person without exception. It is the kind of problem which demands the most careful, painstaking study and review, with consideration given to all opinions. In this matter haste is not only impermissible, it is quite simply dangerous with regard to interethnic relations."

"Recently, at the previous session in particular, we found an avenue toward consolidation. So why should we once again today make a hasty decision on such a fundamental issue without first consulting the people? We have also been pointed in that direction by a proposal submitted by the working group on the status of Estonian, which as early as last summer suggested that this article of the Estonian SSR Constitution and the draft Language Law be submitted for public discussion prior to their consideration by a Supreme Soviet session. However, this has only been done with regard to the draft law. Yet the amendments to the Constitution, which have the highest legal status, have not been discussed."

"It is also very important that such fundamental articles of the constitution not be adopted by a unanimous decision rather than by a simple majority vote. Can any



article of the constitution function if it was not clearly adopted by all the people? The new version has not been published, therefore the constitutional amendment will not be comprehensible to our constituents; they will perceive it as a constitutional reinforcement of the previous redaction of the Language Law. The version prepared by the Commission on Legislative Recommendations contains this shortcoming."

"In my opinion there are two alternatives which would satisfy a majority of our constituents. They are: to discuss the constitutional amendment in all its different versions but not to reach a decision until the law and the constitutional amendment have been submitted for public discussion. Or, if we do pass the amendment then it should declare Estonian the official language and provide straightforward guarantees that Russian will function as the language of interethnic communication. We already have an example of this—the LiSSR has taken this step."

"The majority of us are communists. So let us consider this matter from the standpoint of our conscience and honor as communists."

"As a member of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and of the Commission on the Status of a State Language I would like to state with full responsibility that the claim that the draft Language Law was discussed without public participation is extremely irresponsible," said deputy K. Kiysk. "We worked on the Language Law for over four months. Each stage of that work, every meeting, was reported thoroughly and in detail in the press, over radio and on television."

"I must say that every citizen of this republic who has even the slightest interest in this matter has received a full overview of the process by which the draft law assumed its present form. While working on it we did not insert any meaningless changes or formalities, and what currently exists is a qualitatively new draft Language Law which taken into account the various suggestions, critical comments and objections received in 11,000 letters. All of them were very carefully processed from both a scientific and a legal standpoint by an authoritative language commission. Citizens who have the time, desire and capacity to become familiar with the Language Law realize that this draft does not infringe upon the rights of any other language. When drafting a Language Law for our republic we proceeded upon the assumption that the application and development of any language is protected within the ethnic territory of a union republic. That is self-evident. It is a logical step and from the standpoint of ethnic culture the sole correct course for the Russian Federation also to adopt a constitutional amendment concerning the status of Russian and pass a Language Law for the purpose of protecting Russian. Our constitutional amendment and Language Law are fully in accordance with the political, ideological, judicial and aesthetic requirements which guarantee

protection for the 55 million members of ethnic minorities whose languages and cultures are considered to be threatened with extinction. Once again I reiterate that the constitutional amendment and Language Law in their present form treat other languages with great respect, while at the same time formulating the issue of cultural autonomy which is of such great importance to Estonians. Let us take this concrete step toward the establishment of cultural autonomy."

"Allow me on behalf of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to present to you the text of the constitutional amendment, which has been discussed together with the representatives of many Russian-speaking collectives who are here in this auditorium today. I propose that this session adopt these changes to the Estonian SSR Constitution and pass the Language Law."

"The constitutional amendment would read as follows:

"Estonian is the state language of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic."

"Legal guarantees and regulations governing the use of the Estonian SSR state language, Russian and other languages are to be established by the Estonian SSR Language Law."

"It should be clear that preservation of Estonian will only be assured if it functions as an official language," emphasized deputy K. Kaur in his speech. "Furthermore, considering Estonia's present geopolitical situation Estonian is the only language that can be established as an official language. We are well aware, for example, of the case of Switzerland, where several official languages are used against the powerful backdrop of such major languages as German and French; in that case the language of one native people, Rhaeto-Romanic, has virtually ceased to be used as a state language. There is no doubt that if there were two official languages in Estonia the Estonian language would suffer the same fate."

"In order for Estonian to perform the function of an official language organs of state power and government institutions, enterprises and organizations must begin using Estonian in the conducting of their affairs after a fixed transitional period. This is the only possible solution. Estonian-Russian bilingualism will be required in certain departments on professional grounds. Language mastery should be included among the job skills required of workers who come in frequent contact with individuals. Taking into consideration the need for all-union communication as well as the fact that Russian is the most commonly used language in the Estonian SSR besides Estonian, we should consider real Estonian-Russian bilingualism in places where personnel come into official contact with private individuals a normal and inevitable state of affairs."

"During the discussion period the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium received 10,494 letters bearing 317,517 signatures; 94 percent of the signers were in favor of the Language Law and only 5.8 percent were opposed. These are very convincing statistics. Comparing the published version of the draft law with the version which we have now presented I feel that substantial, needed changes have been made in the Language Law as a result of suggestions received in the course of public discussion. Many of the amendments are worthy of approval. So that the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers will have a basis upon which to proceed as it draws up additional measures to accompany the Language Law, on behalf of the group of deputies from Vilyandiskiy Rayon I propose that the amendment to Article 5 of the Estonian SSR Constitution be adopted in the form proposed by Comrade Kiysk."

"As we discuss here today the status of Estonian—such an important issue for the citizens of our republic—I would like to say this: I do not have the unified support of my constituents. If I vote against this I will be in agreement with the opinion of some and in opposition to the will of others," pointed out deputy N. Savkina.

"This difference of opinion was prompted by discussion of the original draft Language Law, which was by no means well thought-out in all respects. The Russian-speaking population did not feel that it contained state protection for the use of Russian. Now a second draft has been drawn up. Therefore I propose that it be submitted for public discussion, worked on some more, discussed at our next session, which will be held in January, and a decision made at that time concerning the adoption of an amendment to the Estonian SSR Constitution and the Language Law."

"I feel that these two matters are interrelated and cannot be resolved without public discussion."

"In my opinion there is no doubt that Estonian should become the official language in Estonian territory," commented deputy V. Gnezdilov in his speech. Further he stressed that the intense debates surrounding this obvious solution had come about because the basic points in the draft law on a state language had not been explained to the public and because general discussion took place within the narrow confines of ethnic collectives: among Estonians and among members of non-native nationalities. Hence the lack of mutual understanding between those population groups. The blame for the current situation lies with the republic's leaders. Because no member of the Russian-speaking population, the deputy emphasized, is opposed to an official language; what concerns everyone are questions pertaining to the legal protection of Russian and other languages in the republic. This, too, bespeaks poorly organized informational work.

"On the other hand," continued V. Gnezdilov, "in all the years I have worked in this republic I have never seen any documents forbidding Estonians to sing, give speeches, write or speak in their native language. It is also obvious that the members of the native nationality themselves did not cultivate an interest in studying their language among the Russian-speaking population." Continuing, the deputy noted that the Russian-language press is not always what it should be; Estonian-language republic newspapers provide fuller and more detailed coverage of the situation in the republic. As he put it, in the Russian-language press one cannot always understand what the writer is trying to say.

The deputy cited several examples concerning the level on which Russian and Estonian are studied in the republic. The army receives new recruits from Estonia who do not speak Russian. During their first three months in service they learn conversational skills; in the process no one infringes upon their rights and their dignity or forbids them to converse among themselves in their native language. Yet V. Gnezdilov's son, who studied at Secondary School #19 in Tallinn for six years, never learned the first thing about of Estonian, because there was no one to teach him. "This," the speaker emphasized, "is direct evidence of this republic's lack of a basis for the study of both Russian and Estonian. The need for Estonian to be made the official language is indisputable, but not all of the republic's non-Estonian population will achieve a 100-percent mastery of Estonian and be able to write and make their meaning clear faultlessly and literately. This is what alarms the members of non-native ethnic groups. They need a guaranteed right to do business, converse and write in their native language. We as deputies must take all this into account. For we are a unified family, the citizens of a state ruled by law, and all of us must have equal rights."

[15 Dec 88 pp 1-2]

[Excerpts] "During the evening meeting yesterday," said deputy N. Ivanov, "I sent a note to comrades Ryuytel and Pyldroos requesting that they acquaint the deputies with the text of the constitutional amendment adopted by the LiSSR Supreme Soviet with regard to the language question. This was not a pointless request or question, as it might seem to be at first glance. I am convinced that a knowledge of the text of the Lithuanian amendment will aid our deputies in making such an important decision. I wholly support Section 1, Article 5, but I absolutely cannot vote for the text we have been offered for Section 2, Article 5. I think that other deputies feel the same way. However, I believe we can find a version of Article 5 which will ensure the necessary two-thirds majority."

"Therefore I once again request that we familiarize ourselves with the experience of our neighbors and give this matter some more serious thought."

"Yesterday's consideration of the rather complicated question of language created the impression that we have forgotten how to listen to one another," said V. Malkovskiy at the beginning of his speech. "I would very much like for us today, as we make a decision of such importance to all the people living in our republic, to realize exactly what we need to do here at this session so that we can meet with, smile at and think about each other the way we did before."

"Each deputy expresses the opinion of his constituents and defends their viewpoint, shares their concern over the situation or over a negative solution to the most pressing problems stemming from interethnic relations. One such problem is the constitutional amendment on language status."

"I must say that all deputies, no matter what district they represent, have expressed the same point of view, upon which we must consolidate ourselves, and that is that Estonian should be made the official language. At the same time I feel that I must clarify my position, which has already been expressed in the course of discussion of the agenda. We are conducting this discussion of language status in violation of a Supreme Soviet decision from 8 April 1988 stating that the most important issues of state and public affairs in Estonia must be submitted for public discussion—the constitutional amendment has not yet been officially submitted for public discussion."

"While talking yesterday with Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet deputies from various regions of our republic I tried to understand their eagerness to resolve the question of the status of the Estonian language on this particular day, during this particular session. I heard a single reason given: the Estonians want it. Therefore I appeal to the esteemed Estonian people once again and request that they, as a sign of consolidation and in order to reduce interethnic tension, try to understand us and allow their deputies the period of one-and-a-half months, until January 1989, to consider the status issue, the Language Law and state programs for the study of Estonian. This was also suggested by the working group on language. Its viewpoint has already been mentioned here."

"In proposing this alternative during discussion of the agenda I hoped for support, but now I feel that a majority of delegates do not support this option and we are indeed beginning not to listen to one another, clinging instead to our own positions. A serious contradiction is developing and it seems to me that only Leninist principles can resolve it. In this respect as well we sometimes treat history like a picture: we can hang it this way, or we can hang it that way. One person quotes Lenin from 1913, others cite his letter to the congress. I would like to direct your attention to one postulate which was continuous throughout Lenin's entire life. That is the Leninist principle of concessions toward

small peoples. This is not only a Leninist principle, it is a general moral and human principle. Other deputies who have spoken before me have also stated this."

"Proceeding upon this basis I must say once again that we support recognition of Estonian as the official language in the territory of the Estonian SSR. Taking into consideration the fact that Estonians are in the majority in the Estonian SSR, the constitutional amendment should also take the principle of concessions into account and read as follows: 'Estonian is the state language of the Estonian SSR. Equal legal guarantees and regulations governing the use of the state language of the Estonian SSR, the Russian language—as the language of interethnic communication among the peoples of the USSR—and other languages is to be established by the Estonian SSR Language Law.'"

"That is also not so easy for me to do: in the words of the deputies who represent the city of Narva, in a poll 8,000 out of 13,000 people surveyed were of the opinion that there should be two state languages in our republic. Yet you see what kind of amendment I am proposing. In addition questions arise in connection with the fact that today this is somewhat at odds with amendments to the USSR Constitution, where Russian is not elevated to the status of state language. But you and I all are quite well aware that throughout the entire Union, including here in our republic, Russian is the language of interethnic communication among the peoples of the USSR. In addition, we are also talking about whether such an amendment would downgrade the Estonian language. I think that granting status as state language will give Estonian clear-cut and complete superiority. In addition, the law defines all this. Russian as the language of interethnic communication would give the Russian-speaking population confidence that in the process of additional work on the Language Law questions will not be framed in the same way they were in the first version of the draft law, the one which provoked a great deal of outrage on the part of the Russian-speaking population."

"However, I still propose that we explain all this within labor collectives and not pass a Language Law right now, as some deputies insist on doing. This, too, is a step in the direction of consolidation. I envision consolidation thus: we must meet each other halfway. And in this case I insist that we do not make a decision regarding the Language Law at this time, but that instead we publish it again the press, discuss it and bring it up again at our next session."

"There is one other point which I would like to discuss. I think that there should be a secret ballot on this matter, and I hereby propose this with regard to the question of language status. At the same time I hope that the deputies will support my first proposal as well, the one which I made during discussion of the agenda. Let us stop and think once again about the fact that we must solve many, many problems here in our republic. So many problems have accumulated in years past that we

can only solve them if we work together amicably, hand in hand. Let us join hands and solve our economic problems, then everything will fall back into a normal rhythm through our joint actions."

"It is simply odd," commented deputy Kh.- M. Koppel, "that we are discussing a Language Law in our native republic and that that is causing so many problems among the people. As a member of the CPSU Auditing Commission at the November CPSU Central Committee Plenum, I heard M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, say that there can be no privileges in our country for any one people or any one language. It is precisely for that reason that small peoples absolutely must pass laws concerning the use and protection of their languages. Without waiting for a CPSU Central Committee plenum on the nationalities question. There is no alternative in this matter. Comrade Gorbachev noted that people can only consolidate when they are working together amicably and struggling together for the future of their land and their people."

"I fully support the proposal that the constitutional amendment concerning the recognition of Estonian as official language be adopted in the draft which has been presented here. I would like to say that in this regard we have the full support of the Comrade Gorbachev, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee."

"The question of language," said deputy T. Laak, "is the sort of question during discussion of which emotions are difficult to restrain. However, I will try to do so. We want to achieve several important goals through discussion of this extremely significant question."

"It is quite obvious that the most important thing at the present time is to consolidate all the forces in our republic that support restructuring. No less important is protection of the Estonian language as the bearer of Estonian culture. Now, while we are talking about the need to create a state ruled by law, we need specific steps toward regularization of legislation, including legislation pertaining to the use of language. I will be so bold as to assert that many so-called routine conflicts in stores, in the service sector or on the street erupt precisely because we do not have legislatively defined principles upon which to reach agreement concerning the use of one language or another. In order to achieve these goals we have already been intensively at work for a long time, and now our debates are in their second day. Yet over and over again it becomes evident that we are hampered by our low level of political and judicial culture, the need of which we are just beginning to feel in this session of a parliament striving to function in a new way. Unfortunately, these shortcomings are also reflected in our projects and resolutions. For example, the draft resolution we created yesterday entitled "On the Status of a State Language in the Estonian SSR" led many deputies astray because in fact it was not a draft resolution "On the Status of a State Language," but rather a draft

resolution "On Preparations for an Estonian SSR Language Law." I make the specific proposal that it be renamed accordingly, since the present name seems to imply that it refers to the key issue on our agenda, although in fact it deals with a sort of auxiliary issue."

"As for other very important judicial and, perhaps, formal details, we should realize that we have violated a number of formalities. For example, public discussion of the draft Language Law and of the issue of whether to declare Estonian the official language really went on for a long time, but here today we hear over and over again how formally, according to the procedure provided for under the law, the draft was not submitted for public discussion. And in the version of the draft Language Law currently under discussion its opponents are looking for where, for example, it is written that the Estonian SSR Language Law precludes discrimination on the basis of language. Those words, that formulation, are not included in the law, but the concept is clearly there. At the end of the preamble it states that while protecting the Estonian language at the state level the Estonian SSR acknowledges the inalienable right of citizens of any nationality to develop their own native language and culture and to be equal to all other citizens before the law, regardless of native language. It would seem that this is a perfectly clear statement of the inadmissibility of discrimination on the basis of language."

"People are searching the Language Law for guarantees that there will be business correspondence in Russian for private individuals. I direct your attention to Article 3 of the draft law: a private individual has the right to conduct business in Russian. That is a de facto guarantee that individuals will have the right to do their business correspondence in Russian. Though, indeed, the actual word-for-word formulation is absent."

"These are the formalities which often hamper consolidation on the issue of language, because we are hearing virtually no categorical rejection. But I feel that formalities as well are very important in a matter like this. Therefore I propose, although this has already been said, that since no one has any objection to the proclamation of Estonian as official language, first of all we take a simple vote to decide whether we are going to discuss the adoption of an amendment to the constitution. Say we do say yes on this issue, then I would support the proposal made by deputy Aare that this draft be put to a vote section by section, examining the question of whether Estonian is the official language of the Estonian SSR as a separate section, then separately deciding that the legal guarantees for the use of the Estonian SSR state language, the Russian language and other languages are to be determined by the Estonian SSR Language Law, since the editorial amendments apply only to the second section. I think that this would be a very important formal step, after which we as a parliament and legislative organ will do what is proper."

"There is a great diversity of opinion concerning the Language Law. Proposals have been made that it be adopted immediately, and proposals have been made that its adoption be postponed. As a deputy it is very difficult for me to take my own, personal position on this matter, because I know the position of my constituents. My constituents would support immediate passage of the law. But it seems to me that despite the wishes of a majority of voters right now the most important thing is to achieve consolidation on the issue of the Language Law and on the matter of language use. This is more important than the ethnic self-deception that the law must be approved unanimously. Therefore on one point I am fully in support of deputy Malkovskiy. He proposed that the law be further explained, not submitted for public discussion but rather for further clarification. Then editorial changes would have to be made to the law. I propose that today we make the decision to approve the law in principle, send it to the Supreme Soviet Presidium for further editorial changes and then pass it on to the deputies for serious explanatory work with their constituents. I think that this will be an element of the consolidation which, if I have understood correctly, was intended by deputy Malkovskiy. It seems to me that in this case we are truly doing meaningful work. Thus I propose that the constitutional amendment be adopted in the form in which it is presented in the draft version and that the Language Law be approved in principle and sent to the Supreme Soviet Presidium for editorial corrections and then distributed to the deputies for the purpose of explanatory work among their constituents. On the basis the Supreme Soviet Presidium could, for example, issue a decree on this matter within a two-week period, which decree we would then adopt as a law at our next special session."

#### Latvia's Interfront Holds Constituent Congress

**Congress Opening Day Proceedings, 7 Jan**  
*18000414a Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian*  
*8 Jan 89 pp 1, 4*

[Latinform report: "Constituent Congress of International Front of Latvian Workers"]

[Text] On 7 January in the Political Education Club under the Latvian CP Central Committee, the constituent congress of the Latvian International Front [Interfront] began its proceedings. Some 657 delegates from this new social organization represented various social strata of the republic population including: workers and peasants, intelligentsia and the youth. Their nationality was also diverse. Among the congress guests were activists from the Latvian party, trade union, public and informal organizations. Its work was followed by around 200 Soviet and foreign journalists.

The congress was opened by one of the co-chairmen from the organizing committee of Interfront, the senior science associate from the RKIIGA [Riga Red Banner Institute for Civil Aviation Engineers], I. Machiyauskas.

Those present elected mandate, accounting and editing commissions.

Giving the report was the corps chairman of the Interfront organizing committee, the RKIIGA prorector, A. Belaychuk. He characterized the goals and tasks of the new mass social organization set up to further deepen and develop the restructuring processes. The most important of these are: the consolidation of all the healthy republic forces which are actually acting in the interests of the renewal of society, the normalization of internationality relations and the harmonious development in all spheres of Latvian life. In establishing Interfront, the speaker said, we have proceeded from the view that the interests of the workers from the different nationalities basically coincide and the differences between them do not have an antagonistic nature. Hence, by our joint efforts we can fight for the ideas of restructuring commenced by our Communist Party. But, in recognizing the leading role of the CPSU, we maintain the right to criticize individual party leaders. All our activities will be aimed at making the people happy even now, and provide them with certainty in the tomorrow for themselves, their children and grandchildren. We will be tolerant in our relations with one another as often the opponents of restructuring are we ourselves, when we lack a feeling of tact and lack restraint and responsibility for the consequences of our actions and deeds. Latvia is our common home! Let us not forget this, concluded the speaker. (The complete report by A. Belaychuk will be published in future issues of the newspapers.)

The co-chairmen of the Organizational Committee, I. Lopatin and A. Alekseyev, provided information on the course of discussing the previously published drafts of the by-laws and the declaration of Interfront, with a total of around 2,000 comments and proposals being received. These documents were adopted as the basis. Their further working out is continuing in the editorial commissions as the congress goes on.

During the first half of the day, giving co-reports on the problems of internationality relations, economic development, ecology and human rights and participating in the debates were the delegates and guests including the Docent of the LGU [Latvian State University] imeni P. Stuchka, T. Zhdanok, the Professor from the Institute of the International Worker Movement Under the USSR Academy of Sciences, V. Perevezentsev, the section chief of Latgiproprom [Latvian State Territorial Institute for the Designing of Industrial Enterprises], V. Lerkh, the Professor of the NGU [Moscow State University] imeni M.V. Lomonosov, G. Popov, the worker from the Riga Dzintars Production Association, K. Stroganov, the deputy party committee secretary from the RKIIGA, O.



Shchiptsov, the member of the Baltic-Slavic Society, V. Popov, and the senior instructor from the professional firefighters detachment in Ogrskiy Rayon, Yu. Lisment.

The chairman of the mandate commission, V. Nechiporenko, gave information on its work results.

Speaking at the congress was the member of the Bureau of the Latvian CP Central Committee and the Chairman of the Presidium of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, A.V. Gorbunov.

Repeatedly, he said, from major and minor forums it had been stated that restructuring is a revolution. Looking into the history of human civilization, we can see that the basis of all revolutions has been comprised of a struggle for social justice and freedom. The current revolutionary changes named restructuring are no exception. The concepts of social justice and freedom with each new revolutionary change have assumed a more profound meaning.

And hence, the question of the social justice today in the republic. If one were to judge superficially, we have made major advances in essentially eliminating the privileges for the nomenklatura workers in the area of the distribution of consumer goods. For the nomenklatura we have eliminated virtually everything that starts with the word "special." What remains, for example, the hospital, will be also used by other strata of society. There is a moral and material gain. But as you well realize, social justice is far from being exhausted just by this. Certainly the main idea of social justice is found in the basic principle of socialism: "From each according to his abilities and to each according to his labor." Unfortunately, it has not been so easy to implement this. The upper hand was gained by wage leveling which permeated the entire economic mechanism. There were attempts to escape from this, however the lack of radical measures led to a universal disinterest and even irresponsibility.

The revolutionary restructuring discloses and poses constantly new problems chiefly in the economic sphere. For example, the problem of property and its owner has caused numerous disputes and interpretations. G. Popov gave an interesting talk on this problem but in practice all of this is much more complicated. According to Dahl's Dictionary, an owner is the complete master of the property. However, when it comes down to practice, then things appear quite different.

For example, the inhabitants of Olayne have been unsuccessfully asking who is the owner in Olayne: the soviet of Rizhskiy Rayon, the republic government or the USSR Ministry of Medical Compounds? What is the question about? It is a mundane but fundamentally important one for the inhabitants. The residents of Olayne by their labor have provided a great deal of profit for the state and have long merited having normal working and living conditions. The ecological situation is abnormal, and

there is an acute need for housing and a polyclinic, trade and consumer service facilities. The residents of Olayne have asked for this to be built instead of expanding production. The construction of new production buildings is to be put off for a couple of years as there is not enough construction capacity for everything. But the ministry is insisting on its own plans, reminding them of state interests and the medicines which are actually essential for the nation. But we will never provide for state interests if our activities are not based upon the interests of the territory, that is, the interests of the man who lives and works in this territory.

Over long years, we have grown accustomed to the fact that we are all the owners generally but nothing specifically. Things have reached a point where the concept of "all the people's" has become a synonym for "no one's." The switch to cost accounting will not tolerate such an approach. There must be a specific owner for everything. On the enterprise level in line with the adoption of the Law Governing a State Enterprise, this question has been settled. But what should we do with property belonging to all the people, such as land, water and mineral wealth...? The results of the unrestrained domination by departments are well known and they could be listed starting from the Aral Sea to our own Yurmala.

It is scarcely the case that incapable persons throughout the Soviet Union control the local soviets. Let us recognize honestly that the reason lies deeper in the fact that the local soviets are not the masters on their territory and they do not have the last word on everything concerning life, labor and everyday conditions on their territory. Here the party's course is consistent in that the freeing of the complete power of the soviets and the harmonizing of internationality relations demand that the Union republics and local soviets be granted new, concrete rights in utilizing the socialist public property and natural resources put at their disposal. The meaning of these new rights is to be the full representative of public property on the subordinate territory. And if we wish to realize the principle of "distribution according to labor" whereby each republic itself will fully dispose of all the resources on its territory, then regional economic accountability is the main prerequisite for the real embodiment in life of the slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" We are working for this.

Recently, the question has often been debated of whether republic economic accountability would lead from the dictatorship of the departments to the dictatorship on the spot? I would like to emphasize that the course of the republic government is to broaden the independence of the enterprises, to gradually bring them out from under any administrative subordination and create an economic situation in which the law is supreme for the enterprise.

Let us also give some thought to the question of how we can protect the economic interests of the republic population on the questions of consuming those commodity

resources which remain at its disposal after commodity exchange between the republics. According to the data of the All-Union Institute of market conditions and demand, as a result of the unorganized transporting of goods, an imbalance is created amounting to over 400 million rubles, that is, some earn money while the commodity planned for purchase is carried away by others. In a number of regions they have introduced a system of coupons, various references, visiting cards and so forth. Is this the best solution? Of course not. But I am aware that other areas have not done anything. However, the problems must be settled now. For this reason, in preparing to convert to republic economic accountability at times they debate the concept of "republic money" and of course this concept is extremely conditional.

I have drawn attention to the fact that our documents express a concern over certain separatist attitudes in carrying out the republic's economic and political independence. Yes, if one were to judge from statements at certain meetings, we would have to put it even more sharply. But in terms of the actions of the government and its economic projects, the Supreme Soviet and its proposed amendments to the USSR Constitution, there has been nothing of the sort.

Thus, what does the republic government understand by independence? The independence and responsibility of the republic and its regions, the presence in them of broad powers in settling the problems of economic and social development of the territories—all of this presupposes the establishing and implementation of the interests of all the nationality groups and social strata. And self-financing means that the expenditures of the republic and its regions will be made from earned income and that their financial resources depend directly upon the efficiency and end results of the operation of all enterprises and organizations located on its territory.

All the "strife" over sovereignty and independence is due to the fact that the soviets have no mechanism for protesting the decisions of the central agencies. For example, as for the fate of Olayne, in the given instance, on behalf of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, I sent a letter to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev as the Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The letter is now being reviewed. But is this really a question which Mikhail Sergeyevich should concern himself with? Without a mechanism of protest sovereignty and independence are empty words. The document being worked out on the delimitation of functions between the Union and the republics should provide clarity here and we will insist on this.

Probably the most heated debates recently have developed over those proposals which the government intends to adopt in order to limit the mechanical increase in the republic population. Probably there are no major differences of opinion on the assessment of the situation and the need to limit the mechanical increase in the republic population. Although the accents are different. Of

course, we must not link this problem solely with the survival of the Latvian nation. The permanent inhabitants of Latvia, regardless of their nationality, are more and more firmly stating their natural rights to housing, to consumer services, to food products and consumer goods. It is impossible to maintain the required standard of living for the republic population with a constant, uncontrolled mechanical increase in it. This is a sort of magic circle from which it is impossible to escape by the traditional method of extensive growth. This circle can only be broken by new economic management methods.

But just where are the reasons for such a large and unabating mechanical increase in the population? It is impossible to provide a single answer to this question. It would be far from the truth to place all the blame solely on industry. Certainly the number of workers in industry is dropping, the production volumes are growing, and hence placing the blame solely on extensiveness is not valid. I feel that we must also consider the fact that the republic has many vacant jobs in various areas. Certain industrial enterprises, construction organizations, kolkhozes and sovkhozes operate as pumps emptying into unclosed containers formed as a consequence of personnel turnover and vacant jobs. Both depend upon the conditions for organizing labor.

As you yourselves realize, the situation is extraordinary. The measures should also be, possibly, temporary but extraordinary.

The first version of the draft decree to halt the mechanical increase in the population was discussed by the government in the presence of leaders from the major enterprises and organizations. No one argued against the necessity of such a decree. However, it was proposed that the economic measures be strengthened. Many proposals were voiced on this score. In accord with the adopted decision, the sections of the Council of Ministers over the month are to work out the given draft and in parallel prepare a draft of the appropriate amendments in the legislation.

You might ask whether I myself believe that this document will work and irrational migration will halt. Of course, there will always be natural migration. Possibly we must even tolerate certain temporary surpluses. As a whole, these measures should impel the enterprises and organizations by economic methods to reduce the number of employees and increase the return of labor, employing the achievements of scientific and technical progress.

You might say that the draft of the decree contains certain elements of a command-administrative nature which should be criticized. Yes, but in any transitional period the new does not appear in a pure form without the old. Hence, any transitional period is impossible without administrative-legal measures the necessity of which will disappear as economic management methods are established.

Under the conditions of a transitional period, legislative activities become particularly intense. Certainly the economic and political reforms are being carried out quickly and this can be done only on a legal basis. If we actually wish to build a state of law, then we must rework the current legislative enactments and work out many new ones. In our republic we should significantly strengthen the legal services. It should become a rule that work is organized in such a manner that along with the economists and managers lawyers work on compiling the draft laws, ukases, decrees, regulations and programs.

Of course, the republic must not delay in actually implementing the provisions of the resolution of the 19th Party Conference concerning universal legal instruction. The legal, juridical literacy of the public, the specialists and leaders, aside from all else, will prevent the inadmissibly free interpretation in the mass information media and at various meetings of certain concepts even to the point where they would clearly differ with the demands of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the USSR and Latvian Constitutions, and other legislative enactments. This will also help to reduce the tension in relations between nationalities.

The status of public organizations is an equally acute problem. At present, the lag and even the gaps in legislation on this question are obvious to all.

But probably the most important and crucial work this year, and again in the shortest period of time, involves the elaboration of a new version of the Latvian Constitution and the election law. As is known, elections to the Latvian Supreme Soviet are to be held in the autumn of this year. The list of our concerns and plans for this year could be continued. Certainly all the revolutionary changes should have a firm basis. This is precisely for what we are working, that is, for a state of law.

We greatly lack a high level of professionalism among the parliament members. And they will not immediately become such. For this reason it is essential that the best republic specialists become involved in working out the draft laws. And we feel that we must consult more frequently with the labor collectives and republic public. All of this must be done without hurry but efficiently. Up to now this is precisely how we have always done.

The question of a state language has evoked many sharp and diverse judgments. In particular, claims have been voiced that the republic Supreme Soviet hurriedly adopt a decision on Latvian as the state language and it has been proposed that the same status be set for Russian.

Allow me to recall what was done and what plans the Presidium of the Republic Supreme Soviet has in this area. At the end of January at a presidium session they will review the draft Language Law which, probably, will be adopted as the basis for broad discussion by all the people.

Now a word on the essence of the proposals which have been voiced by certain representatives of the non-Latvian part of the population. It is actually bad if in a multinational republic some language has priority. But it is certainly a fact that at present the sphere of use of Latvian has clearly been narrowed in the party, state and economic bodies. If we approach the matter from principled internationalist positions, there is the obvious question not of establishing any advantages but rather aiding and defending the Latvian language. Having set the status of a state language for Latvian, we are most of all endeavoring to establish actual bilingualism, particularly in the work of the party, soviet and economic bodies and service spheres. Mastery of both languages should become a normal professional duty of the workers in the given institutions and departments. For example, each visitor himself has a right to choose Latvian or Russian. This is a right for the person asking and not for the person providing the information. All of this will be set out in the Language Law. Of course, it will take more than a year or two for the changeover and this should be done gradually. We must have both a physical plant and the proper organization for studying Latvian. And, ultimately, there must be the desire, patience and tact and not administrative rulings or discrimination according to a language principle.

In gradually introducing the functioning of Latvian in office work, precisely the administration of the enterprises and institutions must simultaneously create conditions for studying the language at the expense of the given enterprise or organization. Otherwise we involuntarily can encounter discriminatory actions. This is inadmissible. It is impossible not to agree with those who propose establishing classrooms and schools for a complete study of Latvian.

The necessity has arisen of also taking another decision, that is, to satisfy the needs of the Russians, the Ukrainians, Belorussians, Poles, Lithuanians, Jews and other nationality groups.

We feel that the natural development of certain nationalities living in the republic is also influenced by the fact that in their midst there is a very small layer of humanitarian intelligentsia. That intelligentsia which is capable of expressing the interests as well as leading all the representatives of the given nation. No one can replace the writers, artists, journalists, philosophers, political scientists, political economists, lawyers and historians in this role. Without the constructive activities of the intelligentsia, any national movement threatens to develop into a nationalistic and chauvinistic one.

The way out of the situation is seen in broadening the training of the personnel of the creative and scientific intelligentsia from among persons of the nonindigenous nationality. I fully support the proposals which have been made here and which are now coming in on these questions. I feel that it is worth discussing the proposal of establishing a special institute in the humanities and

where instruction would be carried out in Russian. This institute could become an unique center for scientific research and cultural development and would serve as a center for propagandizing the culture of the various peoples in Latvia. Ultimately, it would assist in developing the culture of the Latvian people.

I feel that it is essential, without pigeonholing questions, to examine other specific proposals. For example, in my view, we should support the initiative of the Baltic-Slavic Society for Cultural Development and Collaboration. For instance, this spring the world community, upon the initiative of UNESCO, is to broadly celebrate the 175th anniversary of Taras Shevchenko. The Baltic-Slavic Society together with the Dnipro Ukrainian Cultural Society has come forward with the initiative and in our republic this jubilee will be widely celebrated.

One of the indisputable advantages of restructuring is the fact that it has aroused people to partake in active political affairs. And while several years ago our advance was at times impeded by a stultifying monotony of thought or, to put it more accurately, the monopoly position of the solely correct thinking and a notorious monopoly on the truth, at present, on the contrary, the palette of opinions is at times so diverse that it seems impossible to agree on joint actions. Recently they held the Latvian CP Central Committee Plenum. The Central Committee Bureau presented a report with a fundamental evaluation of various manifestations of political activeness in the republic and defining the tasks of the party organizations. The Central Committee members were approving of this document. It has been published and there is no need to comment on it.

At present in political life, in my opinion, there is no more important task than developing the habits of adopting mutually acceptable decisions. Understandably, reasonable compromises are essential. We were convinced of this again in preparing and holding the Forum of the Peoples of Latvia. I am counting on the same collaboration in the future for the sake of the well-being of all of us and our common home, Soviet Latvia.

Upon instructions from the congress, the representatives of the delegations laid flowers on the monuments of V.I. Lenin and P. Stuchka.

The speeches by the congress participants continued late into the evening. At the center of attention were the problems of economic and political reform, public education and health, the questions of social justice and the particular features of developing the international movements in Lithuania and Estonia.

#### **Interfront Council Member Belaychuk's Report to Congress**

*18000414a Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian  
10 Jan 89 p 3*

[Speech by A.K. Belaychuk at the Constituent Congress of the International Front of Latvian Workers]

[Text] Comrade Delegates! Dear Guests! At present we have met together at the Constituent Congress of the

International Front of Latvian Workers. The question arises of the reasons for its founding and the future of its activities.

Above all, it must be said that the new social formations both throughout our nation and in the republic have been formed as a result of the restructuring of all aspects of our society's life and which began in April 1985 upon the initiative of the CPSU.

Restructuring is a reform in our views of ourselves, of those around us and our life. It should broaden freedom and democracy.

Restructuring is a revolutionary change in society and a decisive overcoming of Stalinism and stagnation. It means a reliance on the creativity of the masses, democracy, glasnost, a decisive turn to science and to intensive management methods, the priority development of the social sphere, the production of consumer goods, concern for spiritual richness as well as for the culture of each man, each nation and nationality. This is the fight to create a peace-loving socialist state under the law, for the sovereignty and economic independence of the republics within the USSR and for a decisive delimitation of the functions of the party, the state and the soviets.

The ultimate goal of restructuring is a profound renewal in all aspects of our life and the fullest disclosure of the humanistic nature of socialism in all aspects: economic, sociopolitical and moral.

Restructuring was started from above and was commenced by the party. It must be supported from below. For this reason, various forms of direct democracy have begun to develop, including: informal associations, fronts and social organizations in support of restructuring. This is normal. This is an element of broadening democracy.

At present, we feel a shortage of the liberalizing of attitudes, a liberalizing not in the sense of the "inability for active struggle against negative phenomena in social life," as this is defined in the political dictionaries, but in the sense of respect and consideration of opinions which differ from one's own. Previously, they spoke solely about the subordinating of the minority to the majority and not about the clash of ideas. We cannot define the validity of one or another idea by open voting under the conditions of the absence of political culture. Because of this, many thoughtful people, tired of the slogans, the applause and unanimity, remained on the sidelines of political life.

On the eve of the 19th All-Union Party Conference, the questions of a renewal of republic life were opposed in an uncompromising manner at an enlarged plenum of the Latvian Writers' Union. However, after this we did not see any increase in the mobility of the party, soviet, trade union, Komsomol and other social organizations in

carrying out the tasks of restructuring. The idea of establishing the People's Front of Latvia [NFL] was gaining support. But the preparations for the NFL constituent congress, the very course of it and the decisions adopted at it were not unanimously and fully accepted by the entire republic population. Everything in the NFL documents and aimed at restructuring in a spirit of the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the 19th All-Union Party Conference was accepted by the entire republic population. At the same time, a large portion of the population could not subscribe to individual points of the NFL program or also join the NFL. Under these conditions, the International Front of the Latvian Workers began to be established.

Interfront differs with the NFL in assessing the leading role of the CPSU in society and in defending the principle of internationalism and the inviolability of the USSR federation. There are differences of opinion over the status of the state languages and the rules for employing languages in the republic, over the attitude toward military formations and instruction in military affairs, as well as establishing by directive a certain national representation in the republic Supreme Soviet. There is also no agreement over the work methods.

We call our front international in no way because we wish to put it in opposition to the other social and political organizations. The "International" both as a concept as well as an anthem has long been the flag of the workers uniting in defense of their labor interests. The name of our organization proceeds from the fact that all the workers are equally interested in the flourishing of Soviet Latvia.

Interfront cannot be viewed as an organization set up as a counterweight to the People's Front.

Interfront is a social organization which is not aimed at assuming power in our republic. The difference between the social and political organizations is that the political organizations (parties) do set such a task for themselves.

The draft declaration points out that Interfront recognizes the leading role of the CPSU in society. This is dictated by the following circumstances.

- The CPSU, with all the convolutions of our history and with all the tragic errors, deformations and confusions, has been and remains the main carrier of socialist values;
- The restructuring being carried out now is a consequence of the initiative of the CPSU and is being implemented under its leadership. If we want victory for restructuring, then a recognition of the leading role of the CPSU is essential.

As was correctly pointed out by Raymond Pauls, "the party is recovering the confidence of the people and, in turn, trusts the people more. This is the underlying

principle in the restructuring of our society. And even more this is the daily practical work." (The newspaper *Yurmala*, No. 46, 18 November 1988.)

However, the recognition of the leading role of the CPSU does not mean a mechanical following of the party leaders. For the benefit of everyone, we should, are even obliged to criticize individual party leaders. Stagnation should not be allowed to repeat itself! A recognition of the leading role of the CPSU means only that our positions do not differ with the party documents on restructuring, that we recognize for the CPSU a predominant right to shape the direction of our society's development and are ready to support practical steps to broaden restructuring.

Why have not all the current supporters of interfront joined the ranks of the NFL? There are numerous reasons for this, namely:

- The awakened political activeness of the population which has gone unemployed due to the strongly national tint of the actions proposed both by the creative unions and by the NFL to carry out restructuring in our republic;
- The stunning impression made on many of us by the speeches of its individual delegates and supported by virtually everyone present at this congress.

It is impossible to establish democracy by employing in no way democratic methods of fighting for it. One cannot be intolerant of the opinion of someone else if one is speaking about pluralism. All the more in the struggle of ideas, one must not ahead of time establish the image of the enemy and throw up barricades of mistrust.

Let us list only a portion of the fabrications and actions which were put in the barricades separating the NFL and Interfront and at the same time let us reflect on for whom these are necessary:

- The resolution of both meetings of the production collectives from the agrofirma Adazhi of 2 November 1988 on the attitude toward Interfront. "Interfront acts against republic sovereignty guaranteed in the Latvian Constitution, against civil rights, against the Latvian language as the state language, and supports the arbitrariness of the Union departments.... The leaders of the RKIIGA are organizing slanderous campaigns against A. Gorbunov as well as against other leaders." And although this was not the case, the resolution was signed by the secretary and deputy secretary of the party organization and other prominent workers of the agrofirma.
- The dramatizing of the situation and the slogan "The Question Is Being Decided—Now or Never." Interfront is fighting to replace the entire republic leadership (from a speech on 13 November 1988 by D. Ivans at a conference of the Yurmala NFL Division).



A. Paulinsh, a science associate from the Center to Study and Forecast Public Opinion Under the Latvian CP Central Committee, in the newspaper *Padomyu Yau-naine*, has provided a scientific forecast: the number of persons supporting the NFL and Interfront is more than the entire republic population over the age of 9. How can we trust its remaining "forecasts" after this?

Ya. Rukshans at the Kommutator Plant said: "At the given stage of development the NFL does not imagine itself outside the Soviet Union. But a situation might arise when our demands will not be met. We do not exclude the possibility of the withdrawal of Latvia from the USSR." After this, the entire NFL program is read differently. Add here the obtaining of foreign exchange from abroad for Helsinki-86.

Probably what we have listed here suffices. One has constantly to remember the aphorism: "Once having told a lie, who will believe you?" A confrontation plays into the hands of only the administrative-bureaucratic system and those leaders who are accustomed to divide and rule.

In the organizing of Interfront, we proceed from the view that the interests of the workers of different nationalities basically coincide and that differences between them are not of an antagonistic nature and are much less than the common features which unite them. Our internationalism is based on this. At the same time, the differences between the interests of the workers of one nationality and the interests of the nonworking, corrupt elements of this same nationality are of an antagonistic nature and are much stronger than what unites them on a national basis. As recent history has shown, the interests of the nonworking and corrupt elements of different nationalities, wherever they live, coincide and we are the opponents of their "international."

The course of restructuring in the republic has disclosed, in our view, the following main groups of the population in terms of the attitude toward restructuring.

1. Those sincerely dissatisfied with the state of affairs in the nation and in the republic and who have valid grounds for this in that they have labored honestly, they have not stood on the sidelines of social life and for various reasons could not previously have a substantial impact on the state of affairs. These, basically, are the supporters of radical restructuring. At present, these people comprise the basic potential of the fronts.

2. People who do not have their own opinion. They tend to side with the strongest. A majority of them has a poor legal, economic and political level. Working with them is at times difficult before the moment when they begin to realize that they have become the victims of the old economy with its administrative-command methods of management and which have turned man into a "cog."

It is essential to fight for these people, to conduct explanatory and educational work among them, to raise their cultural level and agitate for involvement in the implementation of restructuring.

3. Representatives of the bureaucratic apparatus with unmerited benefits, degrees and titles, nonworking and corrupt elements. They still can be found on all levels of the social ladder and are seeking feverishly for methods to lead the people away from an understanding of the true guilty parties for the decades of developing problems in the nation. One of the repeatedly tested methods of action for such elements is the setting of some nationalities against others. And they have invented many methods, refined methods for such actions. They are the opponents of restructuring and glasnost.

4. Extremist elements who have sullied themselves with collaboration with the fascists, those whose hands are besmirched with the blood of the workers of 1941-1945, the time of the "forest brothers" and the time of Stalin. A portion of these people skillfully depict themselves as the victims of Stalinism. Siding with them are people who are already receiving or hoped to receive subsidies and benefits from the West. Up to now no one has been concerned with identifying these elements. They are rabid opponents of restructuring. The given classification does not claim completeness, for we have little experience but it is clear that there must be an intelligent, scientific analysis of these groups. This will make it possible to accelerate the restructuring process by increasing the number of workers rationally participating in it.

Comrade Delegates! In endeavoring to avoid one-sidedness in discussing the congress agenda, the organizing committee invited to speak here specialists who possess authority in our republic, regardless of their attitude toward our organization. We assume that only in a situation of a free and balanced discussion of Latvia's problems can the truth be found.

Our congress is being held on the threshold of elections for the Soviet people's deputies. This gives it a particular challenge and places great responsibility on us, the congress participants. Our active involvement in the elections should help restructuring. In line with this we must take up certain provisions in our organization's declaration. I am hopeful that the subsequent speakers will add to what I have said.

The basic tasks of our organization, as is set out in the draft by-laws, are:

- Raising the standard of living of the population and defending its social interests;
- Ensuring the further, free development of each nation and nationality of Soviet Latvia, strengthening the friendship and equal collaboration of the peoples on the principles of internationalism;

—Assisting in achieving the economic independence of Latvia within the unified national economic complex of the USSR;

—Participation in the clemency movement. The detailing of the tasks and the ways to carry them out have been set out in an abbreviated form in the draft declaration.

Interfront will inform the republic population of its activities through the press, radio and television and is to establish its own publishing organ.

But the main task of Interfront is to make people happy today, and provide them with confidence in tomorrow both for themselves, for their children and grandchildren.

We proceed from the view that the provisions of the Latvian Constitution, the USSR Constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations) should be the basis for the activities of any organization which merits the respect of our republic's citizens.

We are in favor of strengthening the power of the soviets and for developing the forms of direct democracy. At present, there exist councils [soviets] of brigades, shops and plants. What about the future? If one follows the production principle for organizing the soviets, a break arises. As is presently clear to everyone, what occurs is a dictatorship of the departments. The structure of the Soviet bodies is to be organized according to the territorial principle. It is essential to work to establish a unified structure of Soviet power. There must be total, although this is not good in the ordinary understanding of the word, power of the soviets and their executive bodies along the entire vertical. This corresponds to the task of constructing a socialist state of law. It is time to complete the transition from power in the name of people to power of the people themselves. Restructuring can advance successfully only on a popular basis. For this reason we feel that the laws and decisions on key, disputed questions should be passed after holding skillfully organized referendums. Then there will not be misunderstandings over the questions of state languages, citizenship, the procedure for conducting meetings and parades, the rights and duties of the Interior Troops, the courts and other similarly acute problems.

The question of relations between nationalities is being discussed most actively at present. The recently appeared friction between the nationalities has, in our view, two main sources: flagrant errors of the past and social disorders which substantially spoil the mood of Latvia's inhabitants.

The Latvians feel that they are second-class citizens in their homeland. This sensation arose under the suppression of Stalinism and has not yet disappeared. The equality of languages has been disturbed and Russian in the republic in a number of places has become more

widespread than Latvian. A situation arose when it was very difficult to live in Latvia without a knowledge of Russian while one could get by without a knowledge of Latvian. In this Latvia differed substantially from such republics as Armenia or Georgia. The situation reached such a point that there are persons who were born and grew up in Latvia, including those who have the inscription "Latvian" in their passport but do not know the Latvian language and are virtually unfamiliar with Latvian culture. One might ask what has been the basis for such a situation? The answer is obvious: all of this is the complete disregarding of Leninist principles during the period of Stalinism and stagnation. The task is to rectify these errors in a relatively short time.

It was assumed that each inhabitant of Latvia would master at least the "street" or conversational portion of Latvian. This is not enough. The history of the development of many nations indicates that in this situation after several years (ordinarily two decades are sufficient) a street slang arises which is a primitive mixture of the languages. The presence of slang is much more dangerous for the development of the Latvian culture and language than is a group of persons who have not mastered Latvian. This must be taken into account. We also feel that the main forces and basic allocations must be concentrated on teaching Latvian literary language in the nurseries, schools, VUZes and technical schools. Only such a path will contribute to the development of Latvian culture.

We consider correct the decision to recognize the Latvian language as the state language of the republic. We agree that the sphere of use of the Latvian language in our republic must be broadened gradually, in preserving the feeling of equilibrium. But at the same time, we are also aware that we must not underconsider the role of Russian. V.I. Lenin was against the introduction of state languages. He considered linguistic compulsion unacceptable. In our times a number of republics has adopted a state language law. What has changed in comparison with those times when V.I. Lenin voiced his ideas about languages? The Soviet peoples long ago escaped from the colonial yoke of Tsarism and in all the republics there is a powerful layer of national intelligentsia. We consider that the national republics have taken a step in the right direction if they recognize both the language of the indigenous nation and Russian as the state languages. From these considerations as well as from the consideration of the large group of the Russian population in Latvia, we are agitating for the recognition of Russian as the second state language of Latvia. At the same time, we are in favor of adopting rules for the use of languages in the republic with the granting of priority to the Latvian language.

We welcome the establishing of national cultural societies. Latvia is no exception here. For example, a Jewish cultural society was established in Moscow. The establishing of cultural societies emphasizes the equality of the nations and nationalities of the USSR on all its territory.

The forum of Latvian peoples has supported the idea of establishing cultural-national autonomies in the republic. In furthering this idea, Interfront has proposed establishing in Riga a humanities institute with instruction in Russian and with the rights of a VUZ.

We must also take up the attempts to replace the concepts of "indigenous nationality" and "indigenous population." During the Olympic Games we watched black-skinned persons successfully competing in the teams of the European countries. For example, this was the case of the French delegation. No one in France, with the exception, possibly, of Le Pen and his sort, would take it in their head to call these people a "migrant." France is proud of their successes. These people were born in France, they grew up in it and according to all the standards of the civilized world are considered equal indigenous inhabitants of France.

If the congress agrees, we could submit to the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee a proposal to abandon the recording of nationality in the passport and the giving up in application blanks the notorious fifth point. Characteristically, as soon as we exchange our internal passport for an overseas one, the point about nationality disappears. There is no such point in the passports of a majority of the developed nations. Our respected lawyers who speak so ardently about human rights for some reason are silent about the fact that on the legal level only citizenship and mother tongue are important. Nationality in the Western countries does not have legal status. If something is stated in the passport, it should not be the nationality but rather the mother tongue.

We cannot help but be concerned by a number of observed facts. We consider as scandalously shameful the attempt to separate the mixed schools into Latvian and Russian, when not only the parents are involved in the confrontation but also the children can be drawn in. We cannot ignore the fact that not one delegate from the 196 Russian schools was elected to the All-Union Teacher Congress, when the Forum of Latvian Peoples employed some for petty political revenge. We decisively condemn the involvement of children and students in political picketing and in collecting signatures from both children and the sick for political documents. We view such actions as political cynicism and as a loss of political face.

The question of the mechanical increase in Latvia's population has been heatedly debated. The source for the mechanical increase lies in production plans which ignore the actual labor resources in the republic and which are imbalanced in terms of investments in improving the implements of labor. It is perfectly apparent as to who is responsible for the existing situation. The mechanical increase in the population encroaches on the national feelings of the Latvians as it changes the demographic composition of the public. For maintaining Latvian culture and for its development and for ensuring a proper role for the Latvians in Latvia, it is essential not

only to preserve the predominance of the number of Latvians but also to reinforce this situation. If there is a need for additional manpower, if a mechanical increase in the population is required, then this should be met by the bringing in ethnic Latvians [Letts] into Latvia and the appropriate conditions should be established for this.

A mechanical, let me emphasize, a mechanical increase in the republic population due to the bringing in of labor resources from outside the republic must be halted. There are no persons who doubt this. This must be done by economic methods and with respect of the law, human rights and primarily of those who live in the republic. In considering the extraordinariness of the situation, one must give some thought to improving the legislation but in no instance must we neglect this. Here a positive example was provided at the enlarged session of the Latvian Council of Ministers which was held on 4 January 1989.

The republic has a certain number of persons who are acting from a stance of political and economic separatism. In our view, their ideas represent a mixture of naivete with political speculation. The economic independence of the republic within a single Soviet Union is essential. But the constructing of economic independence is not a subject for ivory-tower fantasy. We still hear about some plans. But where is there, we might ask, a serious, public analysis of the economic state in the republic? Where is there information about the most profitable sectors of the republic economy, about the profitability of their enterprises and about their competitiveness in the Soviet market and on the world market? It must be realized that not only Latvia is to convert to economic accountability. Who would compare in dollar terms the resources supplied from other republics and our deliveries to them? Where is the guarantee that it would not be better for the other republics to purchase Latvian meat and not meat on the international market? We do not see a serious, precise economic analysis of the situation in the press or the TV broadcasts. Instead of this, we are offered general arguments, infantile schemes for the allocation of resources and paper plans for the economic independence of the republic.

The republic needs a major solution to the problem of the priority of agriculture. How many decisions have already been adopted on this question, and how much money has already been invested in agriculture only to disappear like water in the sand? The republic agriculture is burdened down with loan debt. At present a significant portion of the kolkhozes and sovkhoses is operating at a loss. The question arises of where is there a precise program of monetary and material investments into republic agriculture? As is known, Tselinograd and Kokchetav Oblasts in a short period of time have solved the problem of supplying their population with food. And this is in the poor lands of Kazakhstan. Possibly we must learn from them a truly professional approach? Possibly, we have also something to learn from our neighbors: Lithuania and Estonia?

It can be said with confidence that here it is a question of the level of economic leadership. When we speak about this level, the question is one of the personal responsibility of the leaders. Each time that we see an economic failure of the republic, why do we not mention who is personally responsible for the failure? If there are no individuals, then what sort of professional approach can there be?

It seems to use that the time has come when the community should take charge and this community would represent the peasants, the workers, engineers and scientific workers. We welcome the decision to establish industrial and peasant associations. We would like to hope that these associations for solving professional questions would promote professional people who will assume personal responsibility for the success. We need ministers like Pauls, agricultural leaders like Kauls, industrial leaders like Gerchikov, precisely such people who possess a practical, professional sense and professional people must be promoted to leading work and as deputies of all levels of soviets.

In the broadcast "Labvakar" they are fond of the word of the old Russian provinces "intellectual." Of course, in a domestic situation, at a tea party or anything else, an intellectual is a pleasant acquisition. But the times in which we live, the circumstances of our life demand the assumption of leadership not by provincial intellectuals but rather people capable of assuming personal responsibility for the success of the job. The republic is fed up with hearing grumblings about the "hand of Moscow," about the pressure of departments, the impotence of the republic and so forth. As is well known, a bad dancer trips on his own feet. It is not a question of interference, this, of course, does exist and obviously will be, if not one then another. The question is one of the ability to solve problems on a practical level and not on the level of a paper merry-go-round.

There is no dispute about it, the republic needs economic independence within the unified national economic complex. The article by Academician Ye. Primakov (the newspaper *Pravda* of 7 December 1988) "Experience and Problems" examines the ways to implement the idea of republic economic accountability. Our views on a solution to this problem are set out in the declaration.

During the years of stagnation in our nation, a law developed similar to a law of nature: in a bureaucratic organization sooner or later there will be equally as many bureaucrats as desks can be placed in its buildings. We side with the proposal of Comrade Rubiks: "If we in fact reduce the personnel of bureaucrats, if we in fact fight against bureaucracy, then let us first of all reduce the area of space in which our bureaucratic apparatus is housed."

The acuteness of the ecological situation in the republic is well known. Here clearly there must be not only debates but also specific deeds. Actions by the entire community

are essential. We feel, for example, that the active involvement of the community in building treatment works in Riga is a more beneficial matter than showing a treatment plant on television. When the inhabitants of Ventspils are poisoned by potassium salts, there are specific workers and specific foremen who continue to load. When food products are contaminated with pesticides and nitrates, there are specific persons who apply them in excessive amounts. We might ask why do we agree to perform ecologically harmful jobs which are dangerous for our own children? If it were possible to give a guarantee that if the workers of Ventspils refused to load the dusty salts, if the agricultural workers refused to apply excessive amounts of chemicals, then measures relating to ecological safety would be undertaken quickly and unconditionally. We feel that the refusal to perform ecologically dangerous jobs on the part of the executors, if these jobs do involve the creation of an emergency situation, is a completely legitimate action. It is time for the trade unions to be closely concerned with this problem even to the point of establishing an emergency fund to compensate the workers for lost earnings, when their actions are valid.

We feel that it is essential to name in person the individuals who in the republic have sanctioned the construction in Latvia of ecologically dangerous types of production. The Latvian Academy of Sciences must, in turn, be less concerned with investigating the consequences of what has already happened and be more concerned with forecasting the consequences of putting a facility into operation, and now starting with the stage of designing the new types of production.

"Latvia is our common home!" This slogan of the Forum of Latvian Peoples has won great popularity. The results of the forum are viewed differently. Not everything was a success. But it is beyond doubt that this was the first serious attempt to consolidate all the healthy forces in the republic on restructuring. The experience of the forum's work can be employed in establishing the Chamber of Nationalities of the Latvian Supreme Soviet. If this experience is extended, then the way will be open to creating a unified labor front which on federative or confederative principles would include the Latvian CP, the traditional and newly established social organizations and would work beneficially for restructuring.

The aim of our constituent congress is to organize the International Front of Latvian Workers. We feel that the presence of different fronts, associations and informal groups is a guarantee against the still recent monotony of thought in our social life. There should be many ideas. On the other hand, practical deeds are required and we must not forget this. Let us be patient in our relations with one another as often the opponents of restructuring are ourselves, when we lack a feeling of tack, when we lack restraint, responsibility for the consequences of our deeds and actions and when we all simply lack politeness.

"Latvia is our common home!" Let us not forget this!



**Further Report on Congress Proceedings**  
*18000414a Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian*  
*10 Jan 89 p 1*

[Latinform report: "To Assist Restructuring by Concrete Deeds"]

[Text] On 7-8 January, in Riga, the Constituent Congress of the International Front of Latvian Workers was held in the Political Education Club Under the Latvian CP Central Committee. Due to the direct transmissions by television and radio, all inhabitants of the republic had an opportunity to observe its proceedings. Over 200 Soviet and foreign journalists were accredited to the congress. This situation in and of itself obliged all the speakers to carefully weigh their every word and to closely check out the judgments and proposed program measures. To the honor of a majority of the congress delegates, this rule was observed by them. But we are still just learning democracy and not all of those taking the floor had a sufficient feeling of responsibility and the congress presidium was forced to distance itself from certain immoderate statements.

Naturally, in assessing the situation under which the Interfront Congress was held, many involuntarily projected its results, by-laws and program documents to the Constituent Congress of the Latvian People's Front which had been held 3 months previously. In comparing these two events, it can be said with confidence that there was more in common between them than there were differences. Even before the mass information media had repeatedly drawn attention to the fact that the main provisions of the program documents from both fronts to a significant degree coincide and probably this was a consequence of the fact that a sensible assessment of the ecological, political and economic situation existing in the republic was given in a majority of the speeches heard at the constituent congress of Interfront and at the congress of the People's Front. The delegates spoke about the need to resolve various urgent problems and they voiced their viewpoint on the ways for solving them. This reaffirmed the fact that all the inhabitants of our republic, regardless of their nationality, convictions and beliefs, are linked by a common concern for the future of Latvia and for the fate of the generations who are to live on this land.

In truth, the excessive subjectivism of individual speakers produced an excessive sharpness, categoricalness and even extremity of judgments and imbalanced views. But this merely reaffirms that we are in the very beginning stage of building a state of law and our citizens lack a sophistication in political discussion, elementary patience for the opinion of their opponents and experience in working out mutually acceptable compromise solutions. And the desire to adopt constructive decisions obliges us in the very near future to acquire these lacking qualities and experience.

The basic dominating theme at the congress might be called the notion that Latvia in no instance should focus solely on its own, strictly regional problems, setting itself in opposition to collaboration with the socialist republics. The sore points for Latvia are also the pains of all the Soviet peoples. The recent tragic events in the USSR such as the disaster in Chernobyl and the earthquake in Armenia have convincingly shown that only by the joint efforts of all the republics is it possible to surmount the consequences of these destructive disasters. For this reason, the future of Latvia depends upon the consolidation and successful actions of all the progressive forces in the USSR favoring restructuring.

The republic population has responded actively to all the events which occurred at the congress. Many telegrams and telephone calls were sent to it. The varying attitude toward the congress, naturally, also determined the tone of these messages. Among them were ardent congratulations and greetings and wishes for successful work but there were also sharp arguments and fundamental disagreements with the very fact of conducting the congress. The co-chairman of the organizing committee described all of this openly to the journalists at a press conference.

It must be said that the preparations for the congress and its work were conducted in an atmosphere of certain tension. However, to the honor of the supporters of other movements and informal organizations, it must be said that this time they did not picket or carry out alternative actions.

By a moment of silence the congress paid homage to the memory of the innocent victims of the Stalinist repressions in Latvia. Representatives of the delegations laid flowers on the monuments to V.I. Lenin and P. Stuchka.

The congress adopted by-laws, a declaration of the main areas for the activities of Interfront and a number of resolutions covering a broad range of economic, social, ecological, legal, internationality, demographic and other problems.

The congress also elected the Interfront Council with a membership of 85 persons.

Prior to the closing of the congress, the member of the Interfront Council, A.K. Belaychuk, made a concluding speech to those present. He reemphasized that the main task of Interfront is to assist restructuring in every possible way and to consolidate all the progressive social forces in the fight against the vestiges of the administrative-bureaucratic system and which stands as a stumbling block on the path of the political and socioeconomic reorganization of society.

**Officials Criticize Lithuanian Liberty League's 10 Jan Meeting**  
*18000509*

[Editorial Report] Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian on 12 January 1989 publishes on page 3 two official announcements critical of the Lithuanian Liberty



League's conduct at a meeting, "authorized by the Vilnius Lenin Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies economic committee," on 10 January in Nagor park, Vilnius. Protocols of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact were analyzed at the meeting. The LiSSR Procurator's statement accuses the Lithuanian Liberty League of not adhering to the requirements of constitutional regulations. "Orators at the meeting slandered the Soviet state structure in Lithuania, summoned youth not to fulfill their constitutional obligation of military service, and insulted the republic government's leadership. Such claims do not correspond to the understandings of democracy and glasnost, contradict the purposes of the Constitution and laws. In the future, similar activities will be regulated by stipulated legal measures."

The Vilnius City Committee of the Lithuanian CP and Executive Committee of the Soviet of People's Deputies issued the following communique:

"When the Lithuanian Liberty League was authorized to hold a meeting on 10 January in Nagor Park, Vilnius, its organizers' attention was drawn to the necessity of observing order... Despite this, moods expressed at the meeting were hostile to the goals of socialism and insulted the republic's leadership. Similar attacks were also tolerated in previous Lithuanian Liberty League actions. Having evaluated everything, we declare that similar activities disorient society and bring division to its unity and cohesion at a particularly responsible stage of perestroyka in political and economic life.

**BSSR Purge Victims, Afghanistan War Dead to be Commemorated**

18000391 Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA  
in Russian 1 Dec 88 p 3

[Interview with A. Petrashkevich, deputy chief editor, Belorusskaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, by BELTA correspondent A. Volvachev, in Minsk: "Give Us Back the Lost Memories": date and place not specified]

[Text] History does not know of any "blank spaces." The historical process is objective. For a variety of reasons, only our knowledge of this process can be subjective. We are presently experiencing a time of bitter acknowledgements; we are uncovering facts and events in the country's life which have been hidden behind strata of time. This is not merely for the sake of repentance, since the triumph of historical truth serves as a safeguard against repeating past mistakes and as an affirmation of the moral health of a society which is undergoing a therapeutic cleansing.

The editorial office of the Belorusskaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya has undertaken the selection of materials to be included in a book dealing with the victims of unlawful repressions which took place during the time of the personality cult. Also in preparation is a book on the

subject of internationalist soldiers killed in action in Afghanistan. A BELTA correspondent requested Deputy Chief Editor Aleksandr Petrashkevich to discuss this work in some detail.

[BELTA correspondent] Aleksandr Leontyevich, it was only recently that the Belorusskaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya editorial office decided to immortalize victims of Stalinist terror in a special publication. However, as far as I know, you have been selecting pertinent materials for a number of years. Why has no mention been made of this book?

[Petrashkevich] There has indeed been such a selection. Information has been added to our files, changes have been made in encyclopedia entries, and a search has been underway for factual information on people rehabilitated after the 20th Party Congress.

Systematic processing of this data for publication in a separate book is in itself a fairly laborious and very responsible task. In addition, access to many documents dating from those years has been limited until recently even for us. The decision to prepare a commemorative publication was made possible by the active assistance and support of the Central Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party.

[BELTA correspondent] You mentioned changes in the encyclopedia. Does this mean that you will discontinue, finally, wordings relative to certain persons of that time such as: "Died in 1937?"

[Petrashkevich] Such phrases will indeed be interpreted. In addition, references to logging operations, national construction projects, etc., will be expanded with the truth. However, you will find the most complete information in our future book.

[BELTA correspondent] Does that mean that you will not limit yourself to mere listings?

[Petrashkevich] Of course. However, in the case of rank-and-file toilers who suffered under the lawlessness, for example, it is very difficult to find out anything at this date. We hope to receive help from friends and relatives - from all who remember the terrible events of those years, from those who still have in their possession any documents, photographs, or letters. You should know that this book will not be a dry collection of biographical descriptions. Since it must be readable, of great importance is completeness of materials at our disposal. We also want to tell the truth not only about the victims, but about their executioners as well.

[BELTA correspondent] What kinds of documents will you use?

[Petrashkevich] Primarily documents which have been reviewed by the rehabilitation committee. Also archival originals: dossiers, records of interrogations, court decisions, denunciations by slanderers. We will also gratefully accept any materials offered by citizens, public organizations, and groups.

[BELTA correspondent] What about availability of your book? How many copies do you intend to print?

[Petrashkevich] The book will be a kind of memorial. It should become a part of every household. This means that there can be no limitation on availability.

[BELTA correspondent] When is it slated for printing?

[Petrashkevich] I would like to say it will be soon. Although you and I are speaking of a book, it in all probability will be put out as a multivolume work. The first volume may be handed over to the printers in the near future. How long can we wait for lists of all rehabilitated persons to be made available - this may take years! Obviously of prime importance is generalization and systematization of information which is already available. And this if we consider only the materials in the possession of the Belorusskaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, hundreds of descriptions of involved fates of individuals, and many thousands of documents. The effort will continue as more progress is made by us and the committees dealing with rehabilitation of victims of Stalinist repressions.

[BELTA correspondent] Aleksandr Leontyevich, my next question involves your office's plans relative to a previously "hidden" subject. Belorusskaya Entsiklopediya is preparing to publish the book "To Their Memory" ("Pamyat"), which deals with Belorussian internationalist soldiers who lost their lives in Afghanistan. Is this the sole endeavor of this kind in the country?

[Petrashkevich] It is a fact that we have as yet no predecessors or followers. The idea was proposed by our editorial associates themselves; it was they who decided to work on the book on a voluntary basis. That is, it was not part of the plan. They decided to donate all the monies earned therefrom to a rehabilitation center for internationalist soldiers.

[BELTA correspondent] Are you receiving help from volunteers?

[Petrashkevich] We sent out questionnaires to all Belorussian raykoms of the party and Komsomol requesting them to provide information on servicemen killed in action. Komsomol workers, including many who have served in Afghanistan, are forwarding to Minsk photographs, letters, newspaper clippings, and excerpts from citation orders. In only three months we received information from 40 rayons of the republic. I would like to tell you about another activity supported by the TsK

LKSMB [Central Committee of the Lenin Young Communist League of Belorussia]. In response to our request, workers in Komsomol raykoms are spending time with families of soldiers killed in action, asking about their everyday lives and difficulties they may be encountering: Does the mother have a cow? Is there firewood? Is the roof leaking? Assistance is to be given to resolve all problems. The TsK LKSMB is maintaining supervision over this activity.

Work on "To Their Memory" is progressing very rapidly. I think that, thanks to our helpers, the first copies may be rolling off the printing presses as early as next year.

**Belorussian History Texts for Children Requested**  
*18000422a Minsk KOMMUNIST BELORUSSII*  
*in Russian No 1, Jan 89 p 11*

[Article by V. Ugryumyy, journalist: "Seeds of Memory"]

[Text] Recently we have been talking so much about the need for the "rebirth" of the Belorussian nation that unwillingly one begins to fear, "Could it be that we are just prattling away for yet another time about a serious problem?" Absolutely everything has been used to explain the paralysis of the popular self-awareness, and absolutely everyone has been accused of lacking patriotism. But might it not be possible now to change over from accusations and the search for the guilty individuals and get down to the real business? What do we have as of today? In Minsk, for example, there is a kindergarten (I know about it not from hearsay, but because my two children went there) where the teachers talk to the children in their native language, and also started a few classes in which the subjects are taught in Belorussian. The achievements, to state the situation outright, have been extremely modest. As has always been the case, Belorussians—and we shall not close our eyes to this—continue to speak Russian and have a poor knowledge of their own history.

What is to be done? Of course, one kindergarten or a few classes will not make any great change in the linguistic situation. But it seems to me that much in this respect can be done by a book. I have in mind not books in general in Belorussian, but a completely special children's book, that would open up to the children the secrets of their own history. And children do love secrets.

In 1982 the Yunatstva Publishing House published in Belorussian, in a printing run of 50,000 each, several small books about the heroes of world history—Jeanne d'Arc, Columbus, Hannibal, Leonardo da Vinci... My son still keeps those books among the things that are dearest to his heart, taking them off the shelf from time to time, each time asking me many new questions about these historic personalities and the countries where they lived. But recently, apparently dissatisfied with the answers he received, the fourth-grader asked me to get

him some university-level textbooks on ancient history and the history of the Middle Ages. That was the strong impetus that had been given to the young mind by what appear at first glance to be uninventive publications. But are they really that uninventive? The artists and writers of MacDonald and Company—and that famous company is included among the initial data—were able in their drawings and texts to take into consideration the children's psychology, and were able to sense even among the children living in a distant country on the other side of the ocean that interest through which a love of history is born.

For some reason I have never seen similar children's books about the historic past of the Belorussian nation or its national heroes. Or could it be that I have simply missed them? No, I don't think so. A rather large number of books on history have, of course, been published, but they are basically for adults. But there has not been even a single book with easily understood texts or attractive drawings that fire the imagination of the young boys and girls.

Is that kind of book really needed? It would seem that there is an extreme need for a book like that, so that, even when the children are at the youngest age, we can drop into their minds the seeds of curiosity and pride for the great past of their nation. And if those seeds sprout—and to do this, it is necessary to nurture them—then it will not be necessary to force the children to study either language or history. They themselves will seek out the knowledge.

To whom am I addressing these questions? To authors, artists, and publishers. To everyone who holds the future of the nation dear. And we must not delay. This kind of book should have appeared yesterday. And in a printing run that would encompass all the curious preschoolers and younger schoolchildren.

And one last thing. In order to prevent the publication from getting into the hands of literary wheelers and dealers who have no objection to getting a little profit from publishing it, it is necessary for it to undergo the broadest public discussion. Or maybe there could be several books. The children themselves could decide which ones would appeal to them most.

COPYRIGHT: Kommunist Belorussii, 1989.

**Officials Discuss Cause, Effect of Strikes on AzSSR Economy**  
*18300301a Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian*  
25 Dec 88 p 2

[Azerinform briefing: ["What Is the Price of Absenteeism From Work and For Whom Is This Advantageous?"]

[Text] The time has come to soberly try to understand the events, to overcome the political, moral, and of course, the economic costs. The full-fledged work of the

industrial enterprises, construction, transportation and educational institutions testify to the stabilization of circumstances in the republic, to people's recovery of sight. It is necessary to cover the ground lost due to work stoppages, not to bring in its cooperators, to deal with unpleasant circumstances. The question arises all the more frequently: to whom was this advantageous, who stood behind the instigators and provocateurs?

The answers to these questions were given during the course of a briefing given by Azerinform, in which leaders from a number of ministries and departments, and representatives of the mass information media participated.

**M. G. Gadzhiyev, deputy chairman of AzSSR Goskomstat:**

"The language of figures is sometimes more eloquent than that of words. Thus, due to the massive work stoppages the republic's industry under-produced by more than 170 million rubles, with Baku accounting for over 100 million rubles of that sum. As a result, the growth in production over 11 months fell in comparison to the corresponding period of last year by 1.5 percent. The level of fulfillment of contractual responsibilities declined sharply. In November alone, the volume of undelivered goods comprised 119 million rubles.

"Not only the republic's industry, but its auto transportation and construction organizations found themselves in difficult situations, under-utilizing in November 62 million rubles on centralized capital investments, comprising 35 percent of the allotted limit.

"The situation in Nagorno-Karabakh should be addressed. Despite the fact the authorities have appropriated significant funds for its socio-economic development, since the events started not a single square meter of living space has been built, not a single school or other project of social and cultural purpose. In addition, for 11 months the shortfall in industrial output was 114.4 million rubles, and 29.2 million rubles in November alone."

**A. Sh. Gadzhiyev, deputy chairman, AzSSR Gosplan:**

"The strikes at various industrial enterprises show their serious effects in the republic's economy. It could be said that a significant portion of the gains accumulated in the previous months of the year were lost.

"At this time, measures are being taken to make up deficiencies. Specifically, according to the decisions of the labor collectives, many enterprises have lengthened work time, functioning on Saturdays and Sundays. Calculations show that considering maximal utilization of all reserves, the rate of growth of the republic's industrial output in annual summary is expected to be on the level of 3.5 percent, instead of 4.3 percent.

"However, the other losses of a moral and psychological nature must not be forgotten; they can have repercussions in our plans for the future. The republic's enterprises are the partners of many suppliers and consumers of all the regions of the country, and a break in accepted responsibilities naturally lowers the level of trust in them. Making up this deficit is much more difficult than increasing production. Under the new conditions of economics, it is essential to support the honor of the brand, otherwise, a reliable partner will be lost.

"Simultaneously, the program of development of those branches of industry in which the union ministries invest funds are being undermined, after all, no one would want to collaborate with an unreliable partner. Poor work, failure to fulfill the plan and contractual responsibilities disturb long-term prospects. This is what irresponsible people have done."

**C. G. Kerimova, AzSSR deputy minister of light industry:**

"The irresponsible elements' and anti-perestroika forces' call to strikes, which influenced a portion of the laborers in our branch, led to 14 enterprises standing idle in a 9-day period. Among these were the V.I. Lenin Textile complex, the N. Narmanov Knitting Association, the Ali Bayramov Worsted Complex and Sewing Association, the Baku Fine Cloth Complex, and a number of shoe factories. Their share in overall volume of released production is 34 percent.

"Additionally, other enterprises functioned only partially for 2 or 3 days. And it's known that over several months, the labor collectives of NKAO did not go to work. It should be said that the stoppages for days on end reflected poorly upon our branch, since the unfulfilled heavy freight plans of that same silk complex "hang" on the economy of all the republic's light industrial enterprises.

"As a result, production of goods in November alone was underdeveloped by 36 million rubles. For 4 days in December, this figure was 19 million rubles. It's not hard to imagine what kind of deficit the branch's laborers will have to finish out the year.

"It should be noted that when the time came for a sober understanding of the events, the workers of the branch's enterprises set out to eliminate the lag which had been allowed, caused by rallies and work stoppages: they decided to work on days off and to extend their work shifts. The measures taken allowed the situation to be improved, but the debt to the state remains high. People are missing the chance to win awards; deadlines for fulfilling plans of social development, including housing construction, are being pushed back.

"The situation is also complicated by the Armenian-nationality specialists and workers giving notice. Administration and social organization representatives are

sending telegrams and aiming for their return to their previous work places. As a result of the work being done, some of them have returned once again to their home enterprises."

**F. N. Ismaylov, deputy director of the "Azneftemash" scientific production association:**

"First of all, something about the consequences of the rallies on the square, which were of no matter to the emissaries of criminal clans stirring up nationalistic passions, clans who are interconnected by knots of mutual support and profit. After all, the workers who gave in to their instigation did both moral and material damage. In the enterprises of our society alone, the average wage fell by 25-35 percent. As a result of undersupply of products and underfulfillment of the production plan, we have missed a significant quantity of monetary funds. This hits the workers of all collectives right in the wallet. The branch, after all, has completely switched over to khozraschet and self-financing. The unreceived profit means that almost half a million rubles will not go into the fund for economic stimulation, and the resources for capital construction will be cut by one and one-half million rubles, as well as expansion, reconstruction and technological re-tooling, and the allocation for deciding social problems will be reduced.

"In the meantime, the grabbers and the speculators, all sorts of low life, inflame national enmity, using this to cover up, like a blind, their dirty deeds and designs, literally and figuratively making their living on the people's misfortune.

"At the council of association directors, in order to overcome the allowed lag, measures were examined for stabilization of our enterprises' work. It was decided to switch them over to a 12-hour work regimen, and declare Saturday and Sunday to be work days, and to implement supplementary assignments to rectify the lag which had been created."

**G. M. Mamedov, chairman of the directorate of the AzSSR republic bank of USSR Gosbank:**

"The events in and around NKAO reflect very negatively on the banking operations connected with providing for branches of the republic's economy. It's enough to say that at times, the collection at trade enterprises, everyday service, became complicated. On certain days in November and the beginning of December, we were missing count of about 1 million rubles every 24 hour period. At the same time, in NKAO, in 11 months of this year, 31 million rubles didn't enter into the cash collection. All this, of course, created certain difficulties while paying out salaries to workers, and provoked their righteous criticism. This problem was resolved only with the assistance of USSR Gosbank.



"However, the release of money in November, in comparison with the same period in the previous year, grew by more than 10 percent. The sum of overdue payments has increased, also. The growth of liabilities by overdue loans and suppliers' accounts alone was 100 million rubles. Naturally, the enterprises' idling aggravated the financial situation for many of them, and finally will negatively affect the family budget of every worker."

The opinion was expressed by those attending the briefing that the goal presented by the anti-perestroika forces at unsanctioned rallies is fairly obvious: not to allow long-awaited changes in the life of the people, thus provoking the people's dissatisfaction, diverting their attention and efforts from the unmasking of the underground realm of political intrigue. However, no vain attempts of corrupt clans are capable of stopping the revolutionary process of perestroika of our society, the renewal of all aspects of life. Those who pushed the people to reckless actions and ignited inter-ethnic discord should be unmasked and called to account.

**Azerinform Report on Gorbachev Meeting With  
AzSSR, ArSSR Officials**  
*18300301b Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian  
6 Dec 88 p 2*

[Text] The search for a path to mutual understanding, overcoming the crisis situation which has formed, bringing our house to order—these most pressing, least delay-tolerant problems of the region's life were discussed during CPSU Central Committee General Secretary, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet representing the Azerbaijan SSR and the Armenian SSR, the leadership of both republics and the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] of the Azerbaijan SSR. USSR People's Artist composer Arif Melikov shared his thoughts on the CPSU Central Committee meeting with the Azerinform correspondent:

First it's necessary to speak of the great attention, the sensation of much concern, which marked the discussion of the situation existing in NKAO and around it, in our republics and in the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and at the meeting in the CPSU Central Committee. The call of the nation's highest organ of state power to show wisdom and restraint in the situation which has evolved, evaluations and recommendations for the normalization of conditions were developed in the discussion of the meeting's participants. They affirmed once again with impressive concrete terms the untiring daily efforts on the part of the Party and government to overcome the crisis of so many months, so that in our republics, within the shortest possible time frame, an optimal, genuinely international solution to the problems will be found. At this time, the immutable territorial affiliation of NKAO to Azerbaijan SSR was restated in all seriousness, as it was underscored by the famous resolution of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Perhaps the peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia are now experiencing their most difficult times. Two nations whose relations have always been characterized by neighborly feelings and friendship have come to an extremely dangerous point. A fissure has developed between them, and everything must be done to prevent this from turning into an abyss. Today, there is no room for mutual offense, accusations and territorial pretensions. It is now time to think of people's sufferings, of how to return to those whom we call, by the glossary of bitter, armed chaos, refugees, their roof, warm native hearth and land on which their grandfathers and fathers dwelled and worked by the sweat of their brow. We must remember, always remember, that all our ambitions are not worth a single drop of human blood. We must think about what must be done to extinguish the flame of conflict. This is within our common strengths and common interests, in the interests of perestroika, to which the Party has moved our country.

Well, there are, it seems, forces to whom such a confrontation is advantageous, whose mercenary, anti-perestroika interests are served by reconfiguration of territorial borders, by provoking the people to disorder, by sowing inter-ethnic discord. But let them know: they cannot go unpunished plowing under people's fates.

I belong to the generation of Soviet people who lived their childhood during wartime, their youth during Stalinism and their middle years during the period of stagnation. Now, as our people have come through renewal, as the principles of democracy and glasnost receive more affirmation in our country, our duty is to do everything to keep this process moving as it gathers strength.

Especially responsible for the developing situation is the role of the intelligentsia, which is called upon to influence the formation of public opinion. But, with hand on heart, can we say that it has risen above the situation. It is painful to acknowledge that it has not.

At the Central Committee meeting, during a recess between sessions, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev proposed to me that I write a symphony about everything which is occurring. I replied that its general tone would be tragic. But now I understand: the finale of such a composition must nevertheless be bright and optimistic, like the belief of my people that reason and wisdom will triumph.

**Tashkent Obkom Secretary on Uzbek People's  
Front, Nationalities Issues**  
*18300265a Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian  
6 Dec 88 p 3*

[Interview with Ergash Ismailovich Fazylov, secretary of Tashkent Party Obkom, conducted by N. Polyanskaya, UzTAG correspondent: "Our Motto: Internationalism": "In Unity of Peoples Lies Strength"]

[Text] Next year a CPSU Central Committee Plenum will be held to discuss ways of improving interethnic relations in the USSR. Preparations for this event are a highly



important matter for all party committees and organizations and for every communist. The Tashkent Party Obkom has held initial meetings with members of the intelligentsia from our capital oblast. This topic was also the subject of discussion between an UzTAG correspondent and E. I. Fazylov, Tashkent Party Obkom secretary, corresponding member of the UzSSR Academy of Sciences and doctor of philological sciences.

[Polyanskaya] Ergash Ismailovich, in our country today interethnic relations are one of our most pressing problems. People are alarmed by conflicts on this basis in the Baltic republics, Nargorno-Karabakh and other regions of the country. Attempts are being made in Tashkent to establish informal groups calling themselves the "People's Front" and "Birlik"—"Yedinstvo." What are their demands?

[Fazylov] Many points brought up by individual members of our creative intelligentsia are applicable to the country as a whole. Take, for example, the problem of bilingualism. It attracts the attention not only of specialists, but also of broad segments of the public. The programs of all the informal groups clearly contain references to overcoming language problems through mastery not only of Russian, the language of interethnic communication, but also of the language of the republic's native population.

They also express the ideas that everyone living in this republic should learn the local population's language and that this will help build stronger ties and teach people about cultural values. This is definitely desirable, but we must not approach such delicate matters with a "dictate." We cannot demand that everyone learn Uzbek overnight, and the same applies to Russian—that would be unrealistic. We cannot ignore a situation which has been taking shape in Uzbekistan for decades. Firstly, we have no academic center. We are still not publishing enough conversation manuals, and we lack good dictionaries and textbooks. In the past 30 years very few people have actually taught the Uzbek language among the Russian-speaking population. The VUZs and scientific centers which study Uzbek linguistics have not published any fundamental works on that subject. In order to have an active mastery of a language a person must know approximately 5,000 of its most commonly used words. A system for learning these has been worked out for the Romance, Germanic and Slavic languages, but unfortunately we cannot say the same concerning Uzbek. There is no clear-cut Uzbek Language Program.

We held our last scientific-practical conference on "Uzbek in Russian-Language Schools" over a quarter of a century ago. The textbooks have not been updated, or if they have the updating has been merely a formality. Uzbek language instruction in the form currently in use is not up to today's requirements. I spent a long time working as a professor at Berlin University, and I know that the West has intensive language courses. They are designed for either six months or one year of study. Thus

far we have not even made use of this experience. If we had good textbooks and good teaching films then many of our problems would perhaps already have been solved. The technical facilities for the study of Russian at Uzbek-language schools are equally poor. It is no coincidence that the percentage of bilingualism and knowledge of Russian in our republic is one of the lowest in the country.

We cannot solve the problem of bilingualism through directives either, by making Uzbek a required subject in all schools. That would prompt justified protest from the Russian-speaking population. There is a more acceptable way: radical improvement of the way in which ethnic languages are taught at VUZs and schools and the establishment of all sorts of small language circles.

Furthermore, mere knowledge of the native population's language is no guarantee that people will be mutually enriched culturally and aesthetically or that they will be brought up in a spirit of internationalism. The channels of mutual ethnic, intellectual and ethical influence must be much broader than solutions to purely language-related problems. We should always bear that in mind.

[Polyanskaya] That is to say, policy on the nationalities question should be transformed from a policy of slogans into a realistic policy?

[Fazylov] Absolutely right. For example, at one meeting with Uzbekistan's masters of culture we talked about reorganization of the USSR Museum of Friendship Among Peoples so that it will schedule folk performances, concerts and theatrical premieres by ethnic collectives on a regular basis and sponsor more exhibits, literary meetings and other meetings between members of our republic's different nationalities. The museum should become a real house of friendship among Soviet peoples. All its events should be dynamic—if that is the case such a house would attract people. It should have a young people's discotheque and show the best movies from all the union republics.

[Polyanskaya] At one meeting on nationalities issues there the idea of establishing a public council on interethnic relations under the party obkom was discussed. In what stage is work on that?

[Fazylov] Today we are trying to do more work with cultural figures. We have set up a council of the secretaries of creative unions' and theatrical and entertainment organizations' party committees under our party obkom. We need to say thank you to the writers for their active participation in this work.

[Polyanskaya] In your opinion is it possible to predict the development of interethnic relations?

[Fazylov] In contrast to the Baltic republics the members of the many nationalities living in Uzbekistan were born here and grew up here, and a majority of them are

internationalists at heart. There are no economic or social preconditions for hostility, because no one is cheating anyone else out of their share. On this point the hotheads from "intellectual circles" who claim that the Uzbek people have been cheated are wrong. Certain acts by young members of the informal groups evoke justified outrage among members of all the peoples living in our republic, and therefore have no support among the people. Complete social justice among peoples is an historical reality in Uzbekistan; this has always been our greatest treasure. This positive potential is now being further developed in order to rid us of many problems and extreme situations.

We recently held a party conference in Pskentskiy Rayon. Among the five candidates for the post of first secretary there was a Kazakh, a Ukrainian and three Uzbeks. Despite the fact that Uzbeks are in the majority in that rayon the Kazakh was elected first secretary and the Ukrainian second secretary. This is a shining example of our people's internationalism. Elections were held on the same basis in other rayons of our capital oblast.

The creative intelligentsia has expressed its opinion concerning the study of old Uzbek writings: they should be studied. I myself take pleasure in reading Navoi and other medieval Uzbek manuscript writers, and this has helped me greatly as a party worker. A person loses very much if he does not know his cultural heritage.

[Polyanskaya] A number of issues have been raised by the Uzbek Writers' Union's informal youth organization. Has the obkom taken any action on this matter?

[Fazylov] The writers invited me to discuss the program of the so-called "Uzbek People's Front." I must say that young people want to help with restructuring, that they want to be active participants in it, and that desire is completely natural. We will do everything we can to support their desire and to help them. But they are not yet quite sure in what way they should apply their youthful energy. Some passages in the program were taken from speeches made at the 19th All-Union Party Conference and others from the programs of the Baltic informal organizations, without any consideration given to the fact that our region is different from theirs.

[Polyanskaya] At one such meeting on interethnic relations UzSSR people's writer Turab Tula eloquently stated that despite all the pluses and minuses of our republic's development internationalism is our treasure. Do you feel that relations between peoples in Uzbekistan differ from those in other regions of the country where tempers are flaring over the nationalities question?

[Fazylov] Yes; I would say that they are gentler. It is evident that we have a different cultural and psychological environment and different historical traditions. In the West they are predicting that ethnic conflicts and

clashes could occur in Central Asia. I feel that that is by no means inevitable here. The aforementioned statements stem from ignorance of the situation.

[Polyanskaya] Are our republic's scientific forces involved with the political program on the nationalities question? Do we have scientific projections on these issues?

[Fazylov] We would like to work together with our country's leading scientists. Unfortunately our scientists are more concerned with abstract problems, historical research or the outlining of unrealistic projects. Of course we need to study the past so that we will know our roots. But all this research should have some practical application. We are waiting for social scientists to come up with a comprehensive program on interethnic relations, atheism and internationalist education and to make specific recommendations for ideologists. Their studies should be absolutely reliable and should be based on documentary material. Mistakes in this regard make themselves felt immediately.

For example, a book entitled "Krym: nastoyashcheye i proshloye" [The Crimea: Past and Present] was published in Moscow. I was very distressed when I read it; it contained many inaccuracies. This book was justly criticized in the central press. Our specialists could provide more interesting material.

Our scientists should also write books about the Koreans and the Kara-Kalpaks, about the Uighurs and the Turks, about other nationalities. For instance, we do not even have a small pamphlet about when the Turks first appeared in Uzbekistan. The party obkom has prepared small handbooks for lecturers. But that is the scientific intelligentsia's job. We intend to discuss these matters with scientists at one of the next meetings on interethnic relations.

[Polyanskaya] The Georgian CP Central Committee has a sociological center for the study of ethnic matters. Will a center like that be established in Uzbekistan?

[Fazylov] In the near future a center of that type will open under the Tashkent Party Obkom. We are looking for specialist cadres now. We have fairly good contacts with the country's leading sociologists. Currently joint research on the nationalities question is being done in conjunction with specialists from Sverdlovsk and Moscow. When conducting rayon and city conferences the obkom carefully studies the opinion of the public and the party aktiv. Sociological research is like an accurate barometer of moods, sensitive to all the nuances of the public's state of mind; it gives us an opportunity to orient ourselves in a specific situation.

[Polyanskaya] Uzbekistan is the heart of our region. We are closely connected to all the Central Asian republics. That is a positive factor. Do you feel that there is any danger of interethnic conflicts?

[Fazylov] No, I do not think so. We are working to strengthen friendship with rayons along our borders. For example, recently we adopted a joint resolution with the Leninabad Party Obkom concerning cooperation in the economy, science, education and culture. Close ties have been established between Bukinskiy and Bekabadskiy rayons and the rayons of Leninabad Oblast. We have very good relations with the other Central Asian republics and with Kazakhstan and Ivanovo Oblast. We have long-term plans to establish a garden/park recreation zone and sports complexes for the citizens of republics bordering on Uzbekistan. They will serve as unique "bridges of friendship" and will help lay the groundwork for close contacts with members of various nationalities and ethnic groups and for cordial human relationships between them.

[Polyanskaya] There are over 100 nationalities living in Uzbekistan. What is the status of efforts to promote the Uzbek national culture, artists' work and dramatic art among Russian speakers and in other cultures?

[Fazylov] At the obkom's initiative the Institute of Art Studies has established a center for the promotion of the culture of Uzbekistan's peoples. Over 100 lectures and speeches have been put together for Tashkent Oblast. We

are planning trips by lecturers and propagandists accompanied by the best arts collectives. This will be a very important step toward strengthening of internationalist ties. The party obkom has also set up its own interethnic relations sector, for which we have great hopes. I feel that the UzSSR Academy of Sciences should establish an Institute of Linguistics which would do in-depth research on problems pertaining to the study of both the Uzbek languages and the languages of the other peoples living in our republic.

Arnold Toynbee, an authoritative Western political scientist, historian and Nobel Prize winner, wrote to Soviet academician N. N. Konrad: "Your country is comprised of so many different peoples speaking so many different languages who are the heirs to so many different cultures that it represents a model of the whole world; by combining cultural and language differences with economic, social and political unity on a federative basis you have demonstrated in your Soviet Union what the world could become and what, I hope, it will become."

As communists we must do everything possible to ensure that the model depicted by this astute and by no means procommunist scientist becomes our obvious, day-to-day reality.

10  
22161

59

NTIS

ATTN: PROCESS 103

BEVERLY FARRADAY

5285 PORT ROYAL RD

SPRINGFIELD, VA

22161

This is a U.S. Government publication, policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

#### SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.